

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN PRAISE OF THE FFA

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take note that this week, February 20 through 27, 1971, marks the 43d anniversary of the Future Farmers of America. This is no small event. In an age when television is given over to the blazoned stories of urban children and adults rioting and college youths sacking the very campuses on which they are supposed to be preparing themselves for a better life, it is refreshing, at least, to note with pride the 443,041 members of this quiet, creative, and patriotic group. Future Farmers of America believe in the age-tested bootstrap theory of individual betterment, not the dole-co-opted hoax of group ennui. In my own State of South Carolina, these youngsters number 10,940 striving and inventive souls among their membership, divided among 242 chapters.

This is a marvelous phenomenon for the State and for America. These are the young people who will bear the heavy responsibility of feeding all the people of the United States, and probably others, in 1990. By that time the demand for meat and wheat will be almost double what it is today, and to do so with pride and with confidence in themselves, they must, now today, live out the dream of maintaining a distinct and viable rural culture in the fact of growing urbanization and sameness. They must practice old Jeffersonian values in a land which, more and more, is beginning to be dunned by the smokestacks and acids of the urban wastelands.

Listen to the sentiments which motivate these most extraordinary young people in our time. The treasurer of one State organization exhorts: "I encourage thrift among the members and strive to build up our financial standing through savings and investments." Imagine, this is said in a day when even our Republican President, much against his past best judgment, has turned to deficit spending for an economic palliative. Not only that, but the Future Farmers of America still voice an oldtime political and spiritual dream; like Moses, the leader of this particular organization defines his function as leading the farming group of today "out of the darkness of selfishness into the glorious sunlight of brotherhood and cooperation."

Such dreams can only endure on the soil. In the cities of the Republic or at the great universities, they would be laughed at. But on the soil, they have a purpose and a virtue. They sustain and embolden that almost forgotten segment of our democratic populace—the farmers of today and tomorrow—to go on performing those simple yet backbreaking tasks without which all the people of this country would weaken and surely perish.

My hat is off to the quiet heroes of the FFA.

DR. SIDNEY D. DRELL: ISSUES AT SALT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Sidney D. Drell is the deputy director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. He has testified on strategic weaponry before our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He is a distinguished scientist. His statement, "Issues at SALT," is based upon 10 years' experience as an adviser to the White House Office of Science and Technology—including the President's Science Advisory Committee, 1966-70—the Department of Defense and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

But in addition to his firm grasp of the scientific matters involved in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—Dr. Drell is able to clearly and concisely describe these complex matters to us. And he understands that, quoting Einstein:

Politics is harder than physics.

I agree with Professor Drell that it is imperative that an informed public constituency for arms control be created.

If the House is to lead this constituency, rather than be led by it, we must ourselves be knowledgeable about strategic weaponry. Dr. Drell's paper is an authoritative statement, valuable to either the well-informed veteran of strategic arms talks or the Member who has had little time to devote to this most important matter facing the Nation. I recommend it to all Members:

ISSUES AT SALT

(By Sidney D. Drell)

For more than two decades since the first light of a dawn that blazed brighter than a thousand suns over Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, the world has been engaged in a runaway nuclear arms race of staggering dimensions and dangers—a "race to oblivion," as it has been so vividly called by Herbert York. The picture of the past decade has been one of evermore plundering of the planet's resources for military arms, a million-fold increase in the destructive power of nuclear weapons in the generation since World War II, and a very poor track record toward halting the nuclear arms race.

Despite this grim background I believe we can look ahead into the decade of the 1970's with optimism at the prospects of stopping—or at least tempering—the deadly, dangerous nuclear arms race between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear weapons deliverable at long range by missiles and bombers.

There are three facts of primary significance that form the basis of my optimism. First—and above all—we are talking. The leaders of both the great nuclear powers have agreed that it is in our mutual and vital interests to get down to the business of taking control of the nuclear arms race and stopping it. Little more than a year ago the U.S. and the Soviet Union entered into bilateral negotiations, the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, or SALT, at Helsinki and Vienna, with the public commitment to do precisely just that. President Nixon said to

the American delegation upon the opening of the first round of SALT at Helsinki last year: "You are embarking upon one of the most momentous negotiations ever entrusted to an American delegation."

This is not the first time we have sat down to work towards reducing the dangers of nuclear weaponry. There have been limited steps in the past such as the Atmospheric Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the Ban on Weapons in Space of 1967 and in the Seabeds of 1970, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. They were significant steps, but in no way did they stop the arms race to weapons of greater destructiveness in greater numbers. SALT is the first serious effort to come to a broad-based agreement directly between the U.S. and Soviet Union for controlling strategic nuclear arms. And although broad-based or comprehensive formal agreements may be slow in coming, the SALT sessions have very important educational value for the participants. Hopefully SALT will continue as a more or less permanent forum to be used by Moscow and Washington to better understand each other's evolving strategic intentions and vital interests. To stop an arms race requires more than solving a set of technical problems and hopefully SALT will nurture the political climate for arms control.

The second fact on which I base my optimism for progress toward arms control is that the nuclear arms race has entered an entirely new epoch. Both with regard to the intentions and the structure of our nuclear forces the U.S. and Soviet Union have entered a quite new era for the decade of the 1970's.

Concerning intentions, we have in recent years developed mutually compatible political rationales and general goals for our strategic forces. The mission of these forces as explicitly announced is to deter a massive first strike. Neither force is intended to threaten to destroy the other nation's ability to retaliate after a massive first strike, and both nations have renounced a first strike policy.

Concerning the structure of the nuclear forces, the development and deployments of the strategic forces by the Soviet Union and the U.S. have progressed at this time to the point that neither nation threatens the other's ability to follow its declared policy of deterrence. These forces at present are strong enough and well enough protected so that even after absorbing an all-out first strike, either nation could return a massive blow to cause immense damage to its attacker. However, neither the U.S. nor the Soviet force is capable of wiping out the total opposing force, and both sides are well aware of this. We are in fact each other's hostage.

The third reason that I am optimistic about stopping the arms race in the coming decade, despite our failures of the 1960's, is based not on fact but on a political assumption—an assumption, that like people, governments grow up and learn. My assumption is that both nations have had ample time to appreciate the futility of continuing an arms race. Although our own nuclear arsenal has grown to the almost unimaginable level of potential overkill that less than one-tenth of these weapons could destroy some three-fourths of the Soviet industrial base and kill more than 60 million people in an instant, we have by no means or measure achieved improved security. The same is true for the Soviet Union. In this sense the race has been a fraud. If either nation were to unleash their nuclear arsenals, the end result would be their own total destruction. As the President's top national security adviser, Henry Kissinger, has said: "Power has never

¹ *Problems of National Strategy*, Henry A. Kissinger (Praeger, 1965).

been greater; it has also never been less useful." The arms race has also become a terrible burden. Both nations have pressing needs at home to which monies now squandered on strategic arms expenditures should be turned. Nor is anyone so blind that he doesn't see the desperate world-wide needs for these resources.

I believe, then, that we are currently at a moment of improved prospects for limiting the nuclear strategic arms race between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Logically we would also take hope for progress towards arms limitation at SALT, whose fourth phase will resume on March 15 at Vienna.

President Nixon has said that the vital interests of both the U.S. and the Soviet Union require that we have limitations on arms both because of their costs and the dangers of nuclear confrontation. Indeed, every American president and major Soviet leader has endorsed in one form or another what President Eisenhower called the "continuing imperative" of disarmament. Dr. Kissinger has written: "Arms control and disarmament are not alternatives to national security policy but an integral part of it."

Recently Harold Brown, formerly Director of the Livermore Nuclear Weapons Laboratory, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and Secretary of the Air Force, and currently one of the principal U.S. negotiators at SALT, has written in *FOREIGN AFFAIRS* (1969) that "In military and technical terms, we can envisage agreements to limit strategic arms which would be sufficiently verifiable to be enforceable and which would enhance both the security of the United States and the security of the Soviet Union."

What then are the problems? Why have we seen so little progress at SALT? After the first optimism of spring at the outset of SALT why does President Nixon now say, as he did in his news conference on December 11, 1970, that "we are very far apart because our vital interests are involved," and why do we still see the growing stockpiles of new nuclear weaponry—ABM's, MIRV's, SS-9's, missile submarines?

What are the issues that have to be resolved before SALT can make progress toward the general goals endorsed by both nations, or before SALT can even hope just to keep up with the expanding arms race? I believe there are three major issues at SALT, three obstacles to be cleared. It is about these issues that I want to talk tonight.

The first and foremost of these is the precise definition—not just a general definition—of our goals. There are widely differing views among top political and military leaders as to what specific kind of treaty we want to end up with from SALT, and I am sure this remark applies both within and between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The term "deterrence" can be given a large variety of interpretations, and what one means by deterrence has to be spelled out in some detail before it defines a specific and clear strategy.

The second major hurdle to progress at SALT is the requirement that the treaty negotiated at SALT can be "adequately verified." National security policy and treaties are based on nations' capabilities, not just on their intentions alone. Any agreement reached at SALT must allow both the Soviet Union and the U.S. to verify that their own strategic situation could not possibly erode as a result of undetected violations of the treaty provisions to the extent of disturbing the strategic balance. The verification problem is not only crucially important, it is a difficult one because the job of actually monitoring the treaty provisions brings us to grips with the greatest asymmetry between the two nuclear superpowers: the U.S. is an open society while the Soviet Union is a closed, secretive one.

This is not the only major asymmetry between the positions of the U.S. and the Soviet

Union in today's world. We are surrounded by friendly seas, whereas the Soviet Union faces NATO on the West and Mainland China on the East. This asymmetry presents the two nations with vastly differing geo-political problems. For example, thousands of NATO based nuclear weapons threaten Soviet targets. Are these to be included on the strategic weapons scales to be balanced at SALT? At the same time some 700 Soviet based nuclear tipped missiles of intermediate range threaten NATO—but not U.S. homeland targets. How are these to be regarded at SALT? In fact just what is a strategic weapon? How do we balance such grossly differing geo-political forces in a SALT formula for arms control? Consider another major asymmetry in our forces: The Soviets have a very extensive nationwide deployment of air defense batteries guarding against aircraft attack, including SAM systems of the type operating in the Middle East and North Viet Nam, and they also have any more megatons than the U.S. in their land-based missile forces; but we outnumber them by far in numbers of sea-based missiles and bombers. How do we balance such differing elements in the strategic equations at SALT?

The balancing and adjusting of these strategic and military asymmetries is the third of the major issues at SALT and has been discussed extensively in newspapers recently—both here and in Moscow. The problems created by these asymmetries are indeed difficult and serious issues for SALT. However, I tend to view them somewhat as gambits to be trotted out, worked over, and exercised, while establishing the framework for settling the really fundamental issues that SALT must resolve if it is to get on with its business of taking control of the arms race. They themselves are not, however, at the real crux of the problems at SALT in the same essential sense as are the first two issues that I raised and which I want to probe in some depth—namely, the issues of defining precisely what we mean by our goal of deterrence and of spelling out just what kind of verification we need in order to make sure that an agreement at SALT is in fact being kept.

Political and military leaders of both nations can justly claim that at this time we both have strategic nuclear weapons with the necessary characteristics and in sufficient numbers so that simply and bluntly we are one another's hostages. Even after absorbing the worst conceivable Soviet attack against us, we are confident that enough of our strategic forces will survive and can be launched, and furthermore enough of these forces will penetrate to their targets that we can destroy the Soviet society if we choose to. Simply stated, come what may, our forces guarantee the destruction of a significant fraction of Soviet population and industry. He knows it as well as we do. Our confidence that no country will decide to attack us is based on the fact that our retaliatory capacity both exists and is recognized.

Following the late Leo Szilard, I call this a "minimal deterrent" strategy. What more then do we aspire to? Do we need to be able to fight a small or medium nuclear war and prevail? Do we also insist on limiting the damage we suffer on our own society should deterrence fail? It is of course a basic human instinct to try to defend oneself directly against attack. Moreover, official policy pronouncements often spell out the requirement that U.S. strategy should also permit us to defend ourselves against the major damage which could be caused by small attacks or accidental launches. In fact, Secretary of Defense Laird used precisely these words before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this past summer in defining the U.S. interpretation of a "sufficient" strategic force.

What we want to ask here is how does this interpretation of sufficiency affect SALT and the nuclear arms race?

If deterrence means simply the threat of retaliation against an opponent's society, existing forces are very much more than adequate, and a treaty at SALT could take the form of a freeze or a stand-still agreement, forbidding any new systems, and setting the stage for future reductions. In contrast, if deterrence is interpreted to include the ability to limit the damage from a small attack, a treaty negotiated at SALT will have to allow for improvements in the existing missile forces. If we think it possible and desirable to engage in limited nuclear fights we will want more warheads and greater accuracy in order to be able to target not only an opponent's society as our hostage but also those unlaunched missiles he is holding in reserve after a limited nuclear exchange. Also, some provision for at least a limited ABM deployment at cities would be required in order to reduce casualties.

But as these damage limiting forces are increased by one country, the other—necessarily judging weapons he sees, not presumed or stated intentions—would feel his own deterrent force threatened. For example, if the U.S. sees the Soviet Union deploying ABM systems or building more missiles and warheads, especially high accuracy MIRV's—i.e., multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles—how can we tell what their mission is? The additional Soviet warheads in growing numbers and with improved guidance accuracy would pose a potential threat to our missiles and bombers before they are launched, and a Soviet ABM would threaten them after they are launched but before they arrive on target. Therefore we will be driven to increase or improve our forces and a technological arms race will continue toward qualitative improvements, even if numbers are constrained.

It is clear, then, that the precise meaning of deterrence has a direct and major effect on what are judged to be the desirable or even acceptable forms of treaties to negotiate at SALT—anywhere from a freeze to a legitimate, although constrained, arms race.

We also require that the U.S. and the Soviet Union can verify with confidence that the treaty provisions negotiated at SALT are being enforced.

I will discuss verification only in the context of what can be accomplished unilaterally by national means alone. On political grounds it is probably futile at this time to require on-site inspection, i.e., to require visits to each other's military bases, missile fields, or test areas. What is more, I believe that we do not need on-site inspection, since what it can tell us that we cannot learn by our technical intelligence gathering systems is very limited, short of requiring a very intrusive form of inspection that would be unacceptable to all concerned. In that context let me quote once more from the 1969 article in *FOREIGN AFFAIRS* by Harold Brown: "On-site inspection is no longer the immovable roadblock that it has been in the past. Unilateral means of verification, available to both sides, provide forms of inspection as effective for some purposes as on-the-ground surveys."

The important question for SALT is: What does it take for us to be confident that the Soviets, in a super-secret clandestine effort behind their self-imposed veil of secrecy, cannot be developing, testing, and deploying a major nationwide system that will all of a sudden bloom before our eyes, significantly alter the strategic balance under a treaty, and rob us of our confidence in our ability to deter them from attack? For example, just what do we require in order to be confident that the very extensively deployed Soviet surface-to-air missiles for air defense against bombers aren't secretly being upgraded to blossom suddenly as an ABM system, a possibility raised on many occasions by Pentagon spokesmen?

Even when one has at his disposal all the information about U.S. reconnaissance and

surveillance systems this is not an easy question to judge. To some, this spectre of a suddenly disappearing deterrence seems very much more real than to others. Expressions of such fears have intensified since the rapid Soviet air defense build-up at the Suez Canal. There is however very little relation between the two situations. Whereas the balance at Suez could indeed be changed in a matter of days, the strategic balance between the U.S. and the Soviet Union can be disturbed only on a time scale of many years which is long enough to allow either nation to respond to treaty violations. There is no such thing as suddenly disappearing strategic deterrence capability. But as the events at the Suez Canal have made very clear, treaties and their enforcement must be based on the actual conditions, and not primarily on intent or promises.

Since the techniques available to the U.S. for verification and surveillance cannot be discussed in public there is not too much that I can say on this problem to help you arrive at your own conclusions as to how well we can enforce different provisions in a SALT treaty. I can however, state two general observations—you might even call them principles—concerning verification of treaty provisions on which to base comparative if not absolute judgments.

The first of these concerns testing. Although Soviet research and development work is carried on in secrecy and we may know little if anything about such work, there is of necessity a long testing, evaluation, and troop training cycle that precedes introduction of new systems into one's strategic forces. We can monitor such a testing, evaluation, and training cycle for major new strategic systems—offensive as well as defensive ones; therefore, it is much easier for us to verify compliance with a treaty that includes both a testing and a deployment ban of new weapons systems than it is to verify compliance with detailed treaty provisions which restrict numbers of specific new and old weapons. For this reason I consider that an important principle to establish at SALT is that of test restraints.

A second general observation is that the verification requirements are more severe the more finely tuned and delicately balanced the terms of the treaty. The more comprehensive the treaty or the more stringent the restrictions, the less sensitive the strategic balance is to cheating, evasion, or sudden abrogation by one party to the agreement.

According to these observations or principles about the nature and demands of the verification problem, I conclude it is easier to verify SALT treaties that permit no changes in existing offensive and defensive systems than it is to verify those which legislate and codify specific changes in kinds or numbers. Big steps toward limiting arms are actually less sensitive to cheating than are small steps.

It follows then that a SALT treaty that bans the testing as well as the deployment of new weapons systems, and freezes forces at or near their present levels, is the easiest to verify.

I would like to state at this time my own views with respect to such a freeze. What I interpret "deterrence" to mean as a policy is fully—indeed extravagantly—satisfied by the forces presently deployed; and completion of those additional forces that are presently under active construction perturbs the balance of U.S. and Soviet forces only in minor ways. However, I believe that massive deployments of the latest weapons systems that technology has spawned—the MIRV's and ABM's—will in the future make it more difficult rather than less difficult to re-establish the stability of balanced deterrents. Therefore, I endorse precisely what Lyndon Johnson first proposed back in 1964 in his Presidential Message to the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva: "... a verified

freeze of the number and characteristics of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive vehicles."

I also believe that our national reconnaissance and surveillance devices are fully adequate to verify compliance with such a freeze if we are willing to forbid the flight testing, as well as the deployment, of new systems. I am not talking here about restraints on research and development work but about prohibitions on flight testing of new systems. For this we have no need to require visits to each other's test areas or military bases—i.e., there is no need for on-site inspection which to be of value would have to be very intrusive and which in any case is undoubtedly politically unacceptable.

I believe that such a freeze coupled with test restraints achieves all the most desirable goals we can hope for from Stage I of SALT:

- (1) Confidence that our present deterrent capabilities will be maintained.
- (2) A halt to the arms race in both its quantitative and qualitative aspects.
- (3) A simple treaty that can be readily verified. Its provisions require a minimum of collateral constraints or indicators. There is no need to define precisely how much of what a nation can do where and when.

It will also set the scene for Stage II of SALT. Once having stopped the deadly and costly arms race, we can start on the path to reductions of forces from their present monstrous levels of potential overkill.

The keys to this proposal are that we are satisfied with deterrence as it now exists, i.e., with a minimal deterrence, and that we renounce damage limiting or war fighting strategies; and furthermore that we are willing to put a damper on the technological as well as the quantitative arms race between the U.S. and the Soviet Union by restricting testing.

Is anything wrong with this solution? We ask naturally what risks and dangers would we be exposed to if such a treaty were negotiated at SALT. It is important to recognize that there is some risk associated with any arms control negotiations and treaty. However there is also very great risk with continuing an arms race. The challenge is to balance the risks associated with the various possible strategic policies and to judge what is politically acceptable in the context of this balance. I view this problem as follows: There are two alleged risks in a policy of minimal deterrence coupled with a freeze on the testing and deploying of new weapons. The first is that we would be limiting what we could do if deterrence fails. We would be unable to limit damage to ourselves in the event that deterrence fails, or in the face of a small attack or accident originating from the Soviet Union or from a newly emerging nuclear power. The second alleged risk is that because of the restraints against testing new systems we will be vulnerable to technological surprises that in time could erode our deterrent.

A strong R&D—research and development—program will provide the necessary safeguards against this second risk. There is a major difference between developing new technologies with R&D in the laboratories and deploying weapons systems that incorporate these new advances. There would be no constraint on R&D. An R&D constraint would to my mind be both unverifiable and undesirable since it would leave one more exposed to technological surprises. There is no virtue in that. By prohibiting full scale testing of advanced new systems we would however effectively prevent their deployment. Without a realistic test and evaluation program a nation's military and strategic planners will be unable to develop the confidence in a new weapons system that they have if their entire strategic policy and national survival depend on its successful operation. Neither the U.S. nor the Soviet Union should gain a decisive advantage from such a test

prohibition. Without the cost of major test and evaluation programs and of new weapons deployments very much more money would be available to devote to an effective, and I think improved, R&D program in order to maintain the desired hedge against the future. The brake on the arms race would be supplied directly and effectively by constraints and outright prohibitions of the testing and evaluation work—and that is precisely where I think the control on arms technology and spending should be applied.

Although testing of new systems would be prohibited we would allow limited testing of existing systems in order to retain the necessary operational confidence in our present forces. Such a test restraint could be monitored and enforced with little difficulty and we could verify that no new threat to our deterrent forces was developing.

How can we judge the first alleged risk that I mentioned earlier of having no way at all to limit damage to ourselves should deterrence fail? Almost everyone who has studied the problem agrees that there is no such thing as an effective defense against all-out attack in this modern missile era when just one warhead or one ICBM carries more destructive power than rained from the skies in all of World War II, and when that warhead can be delivered so accurately from across the oceans that if targeted for San Francisco there will no longer be a San Francisco. However, human instinct drives us to defend ourselves against the possible, if not the impossible. Should we give up on defense entirely by settling for no more than minimal deterrence and negotiating a freeze in weapons? To answer this we must ask how this risk balances against the risks associated with other courses that we may follow with our strategic policy.

Consider the implications if the U.S. and the Soviet Union negotiate a treaty at SALT that permits us to defend our cities against the major damage which could be caused by small attacks or accidents. We will require then a nationwide deployment of some ABM defense at our cities. If, in addition, we wish to limit damage to our people and cities by destroying that part of the Soviet missile force that had not yet been launched against us during the initial exchanges of a limited war we will require large numbers of accurate MIRV's.

When accurate MIRV's are extensively deployed so that numbers of warheads can no longer be counted just by adding up numbers of launchers; when the numbers of these warheads for each nation are much larger than the numbers of enemy launchers they threaten; when their guidance accuracy is precise enough so that they can destroy hardened missile silos that that invulnerable to anything but almost a direct hit; and when large ABM radars dot the landscape, we shall have considerably greater uncertainty about how dangerous a threat we pose to each other. How will Soviet planners view extensive deployments of such MIRV's and ABM's by the U.S.? Necessarily they will judge the weapons they see—not the words of policy they hear—and it will not be clear whether we are developing damage limiting forces for deterrence or first strike forces aimed to attack and destroy much if not all of their deterrent strength. The problem is that these high accuracy MIRV's and broad coverage ABM's have ambiguous missions, and it is hard to distinguish their deterrent from their first-strike threat. Soviet MIRV's and ABM's will present the same problems to our planners.

This is the curse of weapons systems with ambiguous missions. They begin to bridge the gulf between a deterrent and a first strike policy and will provide additional incentives for deploying new weapons.

This very issue that I have posed in the SALT context has been at the heart of much of the recent public discussion on the Safe-

guard ABM system and on the U.S. MIRV deployments. Since deterrence is a state of mind and is as much a psychological problem as it is a military one, these systems must be viewed with great discomfort.

Indeed I have no reluctance in principle to attempt to defend myself with ABM's against limited attacks—whether launched from the Soviet Union, France, China, or anywhere else. In practice, however, implementing such a policy will inevitably result in higher force levels of both offensive and defensive forces for the reasons I have illustrated. Will this path lead to improved security? I think not. I view the proliferation of weapons with ambiguous missions—such as MIRV's and ABM defenses with broad coverage—as producing a more fragile stability of deterrence.

ABM is particularly troublesome in this regard. In contrast to MIRV's which threaten only the fixed land-based missiles, a nationwide ABM defense of cities poses a potential threat to blunt the entire deterrent force—land and sea based—of an opponent. Moreover, such an ABM system would have its greatest effectiveness in support of a first strike. Let me explain why this is so. Present day technology as well as the technology of the near future leads to the conclusion that an enemy can defeat an ABM defense with ease by building enough missiles at lower dollar cost relative to the ABM and by taking appropriate steps in designing his missiles, i.e., equipping them with confusion devices or so-called pen aids. Any ABM umbrella we might construct would suffer this criticism. Imagine, however, the situation if we were to strike first in a massive attack on Soviet missiles. Following such a strike their surviving retaliatory missiles could be very much more effectively engaged by our ABM since, in addition to being smaller in number, they might not achieve their planned coordination for saturating and penetrating the defense. So an ABM would be most effective in support of a first strike policy. Therefore more than any other weapons system, ABM will govern the level of forces that can be negotiated at SALT as meeting the requirements of deterrence.

If a comprehensive freeze as I advocated earlier on testing and deploying new offensive and defensive systems is not or cannot be negotiated, then I believe that the most important single step to be taken at SALT would be a limit on large ABM systems that provide extensive coverage to as low a level as can be negotiated—preferably zero. I would strongly prefer to establish a principle of comprehensive limitations on offensive as well as defensive weapons systems even if such limitations were to fall short of the freeze that I have advocated. However I believe it is of primary importance to limit ABM. No difficulties at the negotiating table should be allowed to seriously impede progress toward a limit or a total ban on large ABM systems.

If ABM's are banned, there can be no conceivable reason for major increases of the offensive missile forces. As I have argued, it is both unnecessary and unfortunate that we now find ourselves moving down the path to MIRV's. With MIRV's alone, in the absence of ABM defenses, we both remain each other's hostage and a balance of deterrence can be maintained. However with both MIRV's and ABM's we will have lost our best hope for controlling the arms race at this time and we will truly become its driven slave.

Therefore, short of accomplishing a freeze, I think the most important first step at SALT is to prohibit, or severely limit, ABM defenses with large radars and the potential to protect people and cities. I endorse this not as an end in itself but in the context of the vital first step in a series of many towards accomplishing the "imperative" of arms reductions. I would expect it to be accom-

panied by clear and continuing restraint in expanding or improving other strategic offensive missiles or air defense systems.

In support of a weapons freeze I have argued primarily from the point of view of stopping the arms race—not of winning a war should deterrence fail. I don't know what it means to fight and win a nuclear war, nor do I think anyone knows what it means. In fact I don't think there is any meaning to talk about "winning a nuclear war." To my mind the greater risk faced by the world's nuclear powers is that of finding ourselves propelled toward a nuclear war by the mad momentum of the nuclear arms race—of finding ourselves propelled into a holocaust of such horror that there will be no winners, just losers all.

I consider the arms race itself our most dangerous enemy and the strategy that I support is to achieve the victory of stopping it while preserving our deterrent. According to a more traditional and historical strategic theory, we should develop forces to be able to accomplish a victory in a nuclear exchange. This means disarming an enemy—that is, destroying all or as much as possible of his strike forces. Moreover, the technology of modern weapons—of MIRV's and ABM's—permits us to dream of forces that can indeed implement such a strategy to destroy his forces—i.e., a counterforce strategy. Such forces would provide our planners with a broader and more flexible range of responses to threats, provocations, or actual nuclear incidents than simply attacking people.

The possibility of a counterforce strategy was specifically raised in President Nixon's public State of the World Message of last February 18. He asked: "Should a President in the event of a nuclear attack be left with the single option of ordering the mass destruction of enemy civilians, in the face of the certainty that it would be followed by the mass slaughter of Americans?"

The case for such a counterforce strategy has been presented in detail recently by Dr. Michael May, Director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore.³ He advocates developing forces to ensure a military victory, which he defined as establishing the "... condition in which our remaining military forces are superior to our opponent's, to the extent that we could use them effectively in seeking to halt further destruction of our country by defensive measures or counterthreats, of adverse political changes backed by force of arms from being carried out in the future." In support of developing forces such as MIRV and ABM suitable for waging and winning a nuclear exchange Dr. May argues that, if war comes:

"The capability for achieving military victory or at least for preventing military defeat will become the uppermost military consideration in the mind of whatever surviving authority controls the forces of the United States. Retaliation will appear to be a secondary and in fact an unnecessary goal."

Dr. May argues in some detail that the nuclear defense aimed at such a military victory may indeed be technically feasible if we implement fully requirements such as:

(a) Flexible retargeting for our unused missiles.

(b) Post-strike reconnaissance by planes and satellites to assess damage and identify accurately and quickly targets to be struck, primarily unlaunched enemy missiles, but also other military and industrial installations.

(c) Survivable resupply and reload capabilities for our nuclear submarines at sea.

(d) Additional fall-out shelters and food and drug reserves for improved survivability of U.S. citizens.

The case against this strategy is to me

³ ORBIS (University of Pennsylvania, Summer 1970)

a very compelling one and is based on two points. The first I have already given: If either nation attempts to develop and deploy the weapons to implement a counterforce strategy for deterrence, both nations will end up in a frenetic arms race. The end result of this race will be a higher level of armaments and a more fragile stability of deterrence because the additional forces with their ambiguously interpretable missions will bridge the wide gulf that exists today between presently deployed forces for minimal deterrence and those required for first strike. Back in 1962 Henry Kissinger,⁴ President Nixon's top national security adviser, expressed the case against a counterforce strategy in this way: "A counterforce strategy designed to win a victory after we concede the first blow is an illusion." He also noted the effect of such a strategy on the arms race:

"The effort to develop such a counterforce capability would involve us in a *tour de force*. It would impose staggering force requirements on us, draining off all other military capabilities. The mere effort to develop such a force could not fail to lead to a spiraling arms race and perhaps provoke a pre-emptive attack."

The second point against this course can be made by recalling the experience of the late 1950's and early 1960's—more than a decade ago—when the vision of localized tactical nuclear conflicts first traumatized our leading strategic and military planners. During the 1950's many U.S. planners advocated a nuclear strategy for deterring communist aggression—primarily against the NATO nations of Western Europe. Knowledge that the U.S. would employ nuclear weapons from the very outset was thought to be the most effective deterrent to local aggression. It seemed to offer the best prospect of using the industrial capacity of the West to best advantage while off-setting the manpower advantage of the then solid Sino-Soviet bloc. But further understanding of the difficulties of staying in control of the precipitous flow of events during the extreme confusion and devastation of even localized nuclear conflict soon led to a deeper realization of the enormous dangers of such a policy. It was recognized that once the nuclear line or fire-break was crossed the nations were on unknown terrain with no confidence or experience as to how to control the power and devastation we were unleashing, and no confidence or experience as to how to limit the conflict.

As former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was recently quoted as saying about tactical nuclear weapons:

"Once you use them you use everything else; you can't keep them limited; you'll destroy everything."

Similarly, Henry Kissinger has written,⁴ "No one knows how governments or people will react to a nuclear explosion under conditions where both sides possess vast arsenals." Recognizing this danger we abandoned the nuclear strategy for aggression in the 1960's and I believe it makes no more sense today to resurrect the notion of fighting nuclear wars and prevailing. Our goals at SALT must not flirt with fantasies of Pyrrhic nuclear victories. The primary issue is to stop an arms race. The overriding concern is not what we do if deterrence fails; it is to make deterrence work by defeating our great common enemy—an arms race—and stabilizing the present balance.

Although I have provided a technical basis for the views expressed here, it is quite clear that in my assessment of dangers and risks I have gone beyond purely objective criteria

³ The Necessity for Choice: Prospects of American Foreign Policy, Henry A. Kissinger (Doubleday, 1962)

⁴ Problems of National Strategy, Henry A. Kissinger (Praeger, 1965)

and entered into important and determining political ones. They are also the much more difficult criteria. "Politics is harder than physics," Einstein once said.

Recognizing this, I think it is also clear that we must look to our political leaders to lead the way with the vision and dedicated commitment of true statesmen to a real halt in the arms race. But we must do more and that is to create an informed public constituency for arms control which will assist in guiding, or pushing, our political leaders toward this goal. Patience and hard technical work are necessary for assessing and balancing the dangers and risks. They are necessary, for example, to distinguish air defense from ABM developments. But much more than technicians and technical analysis are needed here—and above all statesmanship, visionary political leadership, and the determination that has carried pioneers through deserts and over oceans and mountains to seemingly impossible goals. Otherwise arms control may never get a chance to help us survive.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part VIII of the article entitled: "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings from the 1968 Survey of the Aged" by Walter W. Kolodrubetz.

I include the article as follows:

INCOMES OF THE RETIRED

The probable effects on income levels of retirement programs that supplement OASDHI can be inferred from the analysis of pension levels already made. For those receiving pensions, such payments were the single most important factor in their relatively high income levels and typically went hand in hand with high OASDHI benefits.

Persons with two pensions tended to occupy a more fortunate income position than the vast majority of the aged. More than half the aged couples with dual pensions had enough income for at least a moderate level of living in 1967, according to measures developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Furthermore, very few would be called poor on the basis of Social Security Administra-

tion poverty measures. The income level of married couples with dual pensions was much better than that for their nonmarried counterparts, who presumably need less to live on. These nonmarried persons were in a better financial position than those relying on OASDHI income or with no pension at all, as among married couples, few would be classified as poor.

Less than 10 percent of beneficiary couples receiving private pensions had combined annual incomes that totaled less than \$2,500, 60 percent had incomes from \$2,500 to \$4,999, and 35 percent had \$5,000 or more (table 9). Income levels were lower for nonmarried beneficiaries with private pensions than they were for private pensioner couples, but fewer than 10 percent had less than \$1,500 in income. Eighty percent of the nonmarried had incomes between \$1,500 and \$3,999, and the remainder was sparsely represented in higher income levels.

Incomes of OASDHI beneficiaries with private pensions and of those with no other pension than OASDHI differed significantly. Those with only one pension had a much lower distribution by income class. Two out of 5 of these married couples had income below \$2,500 in 1967. Among the aged living alone, 50 percent of the men and 65 percent of the women had incomes below \$1,500. The differences in income between OASDHI beneficiaries who received private pension payments and those who did not receive such supplementary pensions are clearly indicated by the median incomes, which had a spread of more than \$1,000.

The data in table 9 indicate that OASDHI beneficiaries who also received pensions from a Federal, State, or local government or under the railroad retirement system had total income only slightly higher than that of OASDHI beneficiaries with private pensions. Like private pensioners, they were in a much better financial position than those receiving OASDHI benefits alone. Only 15 percent of OASDHI beneficiary couples with other public pensions, for example, had incomes below \$2,500, in contrast to almost 45 percent for units with OASDHI and no other pension.

Another group in the aged retired population—persons not receiving OASDHI benefits but with a pension from the government or railroad retirement systems—was well-off in comparison with persons receiving only OASDHI benefits. As table 9 shows, their median income of \$3,745 was 35 percent higher than that of couples receiving only OASDHI payments in retirement benefits. Median income for nonmarried women with OASDHI only or another public pension was about the same, however.

For married couples not receiving retirement benefits, median income was more than double that for couples receiving only

OASDHI in retirement benefit income and substantially higher than the total income of dual pensioners and those receiving only a public pension other than OASDHI. This difference reflects the fact that retirement benefits rarely equal preretirement earnings and persons no longer in the labor force would thus tend to have lower income than those still working.

For nonmarried persons the situation was reversed. The median incomes for men and women not receiving retirement benefits were at levels that were low in comparison with those for persons receiving one or more retirement benefits. Nonmarried persons without retirement benefits were not as likely to be working as either member of a married-couple unit and they had lower earnings if they were working. The low incomes for this group also reflect, in part, reliance on public assistance payments for main support by a large number of nonmarried persons, especially the women. An analysis of the role of public assistance will be presented in a later article.

The relationship of private pensions to income levels is demonstrated also by the proportions of units aged 65 and over receiving income from these sources at specified income levels. As table 10 indicates, regardless of the type of unit, relatively few of those at the low-income level received income from a private pension plan. This source was very important for those in the income levels of \$3,000 or more, where about 30 percent of the couples on the OASDHI rolls received such payments in 1967. For nonmarried men and women, it was an important source in the income range of \$2,000–\$3,999. For both men and women it was less important at levels of \$4,000 and above.

Other public pensions were also reported as a source of income, mostly by persons with high total income. One-sixth of the beneficiary couples with incomes of \$4,000 or more reported other public pension income. Nonmarried beneficiaries receiving government and railroad pensions were even more likely to be found at higher income levels, and a fourth of those with incomes at \$4,000 or above had such pensions.

When government and railroad pensions and private pensions are combined, with overlap of programs taken into account, almost half the OASDHI beneficiaries with incomes of \$4,000 and above are shown to have had more than one pension. At the lower end of the scale, less than 2 percent of those with incomes under \$1,500 reported such receipt. Among nonmarried beneficiaries, two pensions (OASDHI and another public or private pension) were reported by about 40 percent of those with incomes of \$4,000 and above and by 3 percent of those with incomes under \$1,500.

TABLE 9.—INCOME SIZE BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGED UNITS BY MONEY INCOME CLASS, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967

Total money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit	Total money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit
	Private group pension ¹	Other public pension	No other pension				Private group pension ¹	Other public pension	No other pension		
MARRIED COUPLES						NONMARRIED PERSONS					
Number (in thousands):						Number (in thousands):					
Total	1,009	392	3,438	166	525	Total	605	476	6,353	343	1,025
Reporting on total income	728	299	2,665	127	342	Reporting on total income	448	365	5,160	278	860
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$1,000	(9)	(9)	4	—	6	Less than \$1,000	1	3	30	24	48
\$1,000 to \$1,499	1	—	9	2	5	\$1,000 to \$1,499	5	13	31	21	28
\$1,500 to \$1,999	2	4	16	2	8	\$1,500 to \$1,999	19	14	18	11	8
\$2,000 to \$2,499	5	8	15	9	6	\$2,000 to \$2,499	28	19	9	19	5
\$2,500 to \$2,999	12	6	12	13	1	\$2,500 to \$2,999	15	11	4	8	1
\$3,000 to \$3,999	27	22	18	29	4	\$3,000 to \$3,999	18	14	4	7	2
\$4,000 to \$4,999	19	27	8	19	8	\$4,000 to \$4,999	9	10	1	4	3
\$5,000 to \$7,499	22	21	10	15	21	\$5,000 to \$7,499	3	8	2	3	4
\$7,500 to \$9,999	7	6	4	12	22	\$7,500 to \$9,999	1	6	(9)	4	2
\$10,000 or more	6	6	3	—	12	\$10,000 or more	1	2	—	—	1
Median income, dollars	4,087	4,362	2,748	3,745	6,270	Median income, dollars	2,412	2,611	1,284	1,649	1,020

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—INCOME SIZE BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGED UNITS BY MONEY INCOME CLASS, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967—Continued

Total money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit	Total money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit
	Private group pension ¹	Other public pension	No other pension				Private group pension ¹	Other public pension	No other pension		
MEN						WOMEN					
Number (in thousands):						Number (in thousands):					
Total	287	128	1,476	109	172	Total	317	348	4,876	234	853
Reporting on income ²	238	103	1,268	87	153	Reporting on total income	210	262	3,892	191	707
Percent of units	100	100	100	(³)	100	Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$1,000	1	—	22	37	31	Less than \$1,000	1	5	33	30	49
\$1,000 to \$1,499	3	14	28	36	26	\$1,000 to \$1,499	7	13	32	28	26
\$1,500 to \$1,999	19	7	22	2	9	\$1,500 to \$1,999	20	17	17	11	9
\$2,000 to \$2,499	24	23	13	8	8	\$2,000 to \$2,499	33	17	8	14	4
\$2,500 to \$2,999	15	13	4	3	3	\$2,500 to \$2,999	14	10	4	4	1
\$3,000 to \$3,999	21	14	5	2	2	\$3,000 to \$3,999	14	15	3	4	2
\$4,000 to \$4,999	11	7	2	8	8	\$4,000 to \$4,999	7	11	1	4	3
\$5,000 to \$7,499	4	12	(⁴)	3	3	\$5,000 to \$7,499	2	6	2	3	3
\$7,500 to \$9,999	1	9	(⁵)	1	1	\$7,500 to \$9,999	1	5	(⁵)	3	1
\$10,000 or more	1	2	1	1	1	\$10,000 or more	1	2	1	1	1
Median income, dollars	2,580	2,812	1,500	1,175	1,175	Median income, dollars	2,302	2,342	1,230	1,290	1,007

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units reporting private pensions but no OASDHI benefits, as well as some who did not report on private pension receipt.

² Excludes a small number of units who did not report on private pension receipt.

³ Includes a small number of units reporting both a private and another public pension.

⁴ 0.5 percent or less.

⁵ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

TABLE 10.—SOURCE OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS BY INCOME SIZE FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹: PERCENT OF AGED UNITS WITH MONEY INCOME FROM PRIVATE AND OTHER PUBLIC PENSION PLANS, BY MONEY INCOME CLASS, 1967

Total money income	Married couples with OASDHI benefits and		Total with OASDHI benefits and—		Nonmarried persons		Men with OASDHI benefits and—		Women with OASDHI benefits and—	
	Private group pension	Other public pension	Private group pension	Other public pension	Private group pension	Other public pension	Private group pension	Other public pension	Private group pension	Other public pension
Less than \$1,500	(²)	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
\$1,500 to \$1,999	4	3	8	5	13	2	6	6	6	6
\$2,000 to \$2,999	14	5	20	12	26	12	15	12	15	12
\$3,000 to \$3,999	27	9	24	16	41	11	15	15	19	19
\$4,000 or more	31	17	17	25	28	22	10	26	26	26

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units reporting private pensions, but no OASDHI benefits.

² 0.5 percent or less.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRECY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an editorial published on February 19 in the Worcester, Mass. Telegram.

It is distressing to note, as this editorial points out, that the percentage of closed committee meetings in the House of Representatives in 1970 was the third highest since 1953.

The attached editorial should be a reminder to all of us that the people of this country are intensely interested in the activities and procedures of the Congress and that they will and should be expecting a dramatic improvement because of the implementation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRECY

Last year, Congress passed legislation designed to give the public a better look at committee proceedings.

Then it proceeded to hold 41 per cent of all committee meetings in secret.

The penchant of elected officials for closed doors seems incurable both on the national and local scene; it seems to survive unending criticism and sporadic reform.

The percentage of closed committee meetings in 1970 was the third highest since 1953, with the House contributing 48 per cent of the executive sessions and the Senate chalking up 42 per cent. The House Appri-

priations Committee led the parade with all 379 of its sessions held behind closed doors. The reason, according to its chairman, Rep. George H. Mahon of Texas, is lack of space for "outside observers."

Reformers try to fight back. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 was the first real attempt by Congress in 24 years to streamline its procedures. But most of the changes are modest and implementation leaves much to the discretion of committee chairmen and members.

For example, House Committee hearings and business meetings can be closed by a simple majority vote. Senate committee sessions may be closed for voting, marking up bills or by majority vote. Senate hearings may also be secret when the content is confidential, related to national security or involves the character of an individual.

So there is plenty of room for privacy. In addition, there will be only one new face among chairmen heading committees which met last year with a high rate of secrecy. F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana, the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, believes the open meeting issue has been "exaggerated" by the news media. "The only disadvantage to a closed meeting is lack of understanding on the part of the public," he says.

Not so. There are many disadvantages to congressional executive sessions. Closed meetings may also allow for behind-the-scenes deals, influence peddling and promotion of self-interests.

To make it effective, democracy must be widely based and open to scrutiny. There are, to be sure, occasions when closed meetings are warranted. But an executive session is a rare privilege rather than an inalienable right; it must not be abused.

The Legislative Reorganization Act is a step in the right direction.

SCLC HEAD RALPH ABERNATHY SUPPORTS ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention in the past to the remarkable coalition represented by those who support legislation I have introduced to create an all-volunteer army. It is heartening to see those from both major political parties, and from the full range of political philosophies represented within each party, supporting a measure that could easily have become the subject of a partisan struggle.

However, there is another remarkable situation regarding congressional attitudes about the bill. A number of acknowledged liberal Members have stated publicly their reservations about an all-volunteer army, including their fear that it will become a haven for minority groups, particularly blacks, and low-income people. Curiously, this prospect has not deterred such prominent minority group Representatives HERMAN BADILLO, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WILLIAM CLAY, LOUIS STOKES, and JOHN CONYERS from sponsoring the bill.

Further, this specific charge was addressed and refuted quite capably earlier this month, in a statement by Rev. Dr. Ralph Abernathy before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Dr. Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, had this to say about the poor-and-black-volunteers argument:

Of particular concern to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is the "fear" that an all-volunteer army will become an army of the poor and black. Such condescending *noblesse oblige* is not only unappreciated, it is downright repugnant from the point of view of the black soldier who is ordered to die to preserve a "freedom" that he has never known.

The entire statement by Dr. Abernathy is worthy of study by all those Members who harbor misgivings about the possible adverse effect of an all-voluntary armed force on minority groups. I include it at this point:

Mr. Chairman and other distinguished Senators, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to testify regarding a matter of immense importance to our Nation today.

We of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference have long been concerned with the status of this Nation's poor and minority groups and with the effect of conscription upon them. This is not the first time in which we have endeavored to constructively aid this great Nation as it confronts its own conscience regarding the draft. Our position has not changed, and it remains today the same as it was in November of 1969 when, in a statement prepared for presentation before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, we said . . . the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is absolutely opposed to the principle of conscription. We view it totally antithetical to the concepts of freedom and democracy upon which this country was founded, and we recommend what we recommend today only as a means of alleviating racial and economic injustice and inequity in a system that we view as immoral, unjust, and unconstitutional at best.

That proposed testimony, though never presented, outlined many changes which we felt could be made along the lines of increased minority membership on local and appeal boards, elimination of deferments, nationalization of standards, selective conscientious objection, and availability and provision of counsel for registrants. If the accomplishment of those ends were to be the guide for our testimony today, we could merely repeat the same testimony we prepared then, for little has changed. But such is not the guide, for that Subcommittee merely concerned itself with the administration and not the existence of conscription while, by virtue of the expiration of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 on June 30, 1971, this Nation and this Congress must face the question of conscription itself.

Therefore, we do not choose to testify today on any matters of reform nor do we wish to support any resolution dictating repeal. The Congress has displayed on several occasions that it has well-developed and sophisticated powers of non-feasance; we merely ask that now, as an act of National conscience, it exercise those powers and refuse to perpetuate the injustice of conscription any longer.

It should suffice to say that, where no national emergency necessitates it, America, a land proud of the liberty of its individual citizens, should not even consider any other reason for the continuation of conscription. Concerns such as the cost, the establishment of a professional army, and/or the existence of an army of poor and black should not begin to outweigh the assurance that

each and every individual citizen can live out his life as he alone determines best.

But, as Dr. King felt compelled to send the "Letter From The Birmingham Jail" to the clergy who expressed honest but misguided concerns with respect to the black man's struggle for dignity, in recognition of the honesty and sincerity we perceive to be the basis for some of the fears of a volunteer army, we feel compelled to discuss those concerns and try to demonstrate their complete inability to justify the continued invasion of personal liberties inherent in the retention of conscription.

The cost of a volunteer army is inconsequential. The Gates Commission estimated that, with a pay raise for first-term recruits, it would cost \$3 billion, a reasonable cost (1) as only five or six percent of a \$65-70 billion budget and (2) as the premium for the restoration of basic freedoms.

No peace-loving American could help but feel some empathy for anyone who expressed concerns about the existence in America of a professional army and the development of a "military ethos" and its effect upon policymaking. And so the claim that a volunteer army may create such a situation strikes a note of fear upon first thought.

One unfortunate but nevertheless true answer to that claim is that America already has a professional army; a \$65-70 billion a year professional army.

And consonant with the fact that we have a professional army is the fact that we do not draft generals; we draft privates, the cannon-fodder of the military machine. Draftees have no apparent effect upon the policies of our armed forces; instead they seem to be little less than fuel with which to propel the war machine. This is borne out by the fact that over one-half of the Army's enlistees who have lost their lives in Viet Nam have been draftees, and draftees constituted eighty-eight percent of the infantry's riflemen there for the last two years. Yet only 368,000 of the 2.9 million men on active duty in our armed forces (or 12.7 percent) are draftees. It is evident that the status of being a draftee puts a label clearly marked "expendable" on a man and that, without a draft, the armed forces would have to devise some more discriminating and hopefully just way of deciding who it is that must risk death. Moreover, those who do run the risk would, by the fact of their enlistment, have had something to say regarding the matter.

Quite to the contrary of conscription precluding the existence of a professional army, conscription is the hand-maiden of militarism. As Assistant Secretary of Defense (for Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Roger T. Kelly was so aptly quoted as admitting in the most recent issue of *Look* magazine, "a conscripted army has an almost unlimited tolerance for wasting people." "If you can go to the well as often as you wish, it makes it easy to misuse human resources."¹ With the draft, the armed forces may procure its "expendables" by requisition, but, if the armed forces were forced to respond to the power of the people and of the Congress before they could send countless men to their deaths, they and the President might in turn be more discriminating in what conflagrations they involve America.

It is the volunteer army's attribute of returning the war power to the people that precludes any retention of registration or any other vestiges of the system while curtailing or eliminating draft calls. If the men who have to die are still available at the stroke of the President's pen, then the temptation for involvement in Presidentially declared wars like Viet Nam is still ominously

present. The Gates Commission reviewed the situations obtaining at or near the beginnings of World Wars I and II and the Korean War and concluded that "Congress has not been reluctant to enact a draft when the President requested it."²

Similarly, the idea of popular control of the war power devours any argument that, without the presence of draftees in Viet Nam, the massacre at My Lai may never have happened. The whole truth is that, if there were no draftees to fuel the military machine, there may never have been any My Lai at all simply because we may never have involved ourselves in Viet Nam or, having involved ourselves, the American people may have terminated that involvement by refusing to participate any further in it.

Of particular concern to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is the "fear" that an all-volunteer army will become an army of the poor and black. Such condescending *noblesse oblige* is not only unappreciated, it is downright repugnant from the point of view of the black soldier who is ordered to die to preserve a "freedom" that he has never known.

From the blood of the first man to die in the American Revolution to the 13 percent of American casualties in the Viet Name War, black men have never ceased to fight and to die for a country that has been all too ungrateful in return. But, if it is of any solace to those who harbor such fears, the armed forces are not now occupied by the poor and black to an overwhelming degree, and there is no reason to presume that they will be so occupied in the future if conscription is abolished.

Currently, according to the Gates Commission, blacks constitute 9.5 percent of the armed forces. Of those 1.7 million enlisted men serving voluntarily in 1969 (excluding draftees and draft-motivated volunteers), black men constituted only 12.7 percent, a proportion quite close to the proportion of black citizens to the whole of the American citizenry. Reenlistments have dropped steadily from 16.3 percent in 1965 to 11.4 percent in 1969, a dramatic decline evincing that, since the build-up in Viet Nam and the death of so many black men in a war with which they could not identify, the armed forces have not proved to be the heaven they may once have been considered.

Much is said about the high rejection rates among the black and the poor. During the recent past, fifty-three percent of the otherwise-eligible black men have been found acceptable while seventy-three percent of the otherwise-eligible white men have been found acceptable. The acceptance rate among black men is rising, but, even if it rises to sixty-three percent, the Gates Commission estimates that, in 1980, only 817,110 black men will be eligible or 22.4 percent of a 3.2 million man force.

The reasons for such a high rejection rate are inextricably woven into the impoverished character of our domestic situation. The standards of the military will remain the same, so a truncation of the rejection rate will indicate a higher standard of living which would in turn lessen the claimed attractiveness that the military has for the poor. And, until the standard of living is raised, those same dismal conditions which are alleged to drive us to the recruitment office will turn us away at the entry station. Moreover, a decent pay-level for first-term recruits will attract the white, middle class, the existing pay-level, as low as it is, already being "attractive" to us.

As I just pointed out, even with an acceptance rate of sixty-three percent, black Americans could constitute no more than

¹ Moskin, "Uncle Sam Still Wants You, Kid", *Look*, XXXV, No. 4 (Feb. 23, 1971), pp. 21-23.

² Report of the President's Commission On An All-Volunteer Force, GPO: 1970, p. 121.

22.4 percent of the armed forces by 1980. But, on the basis of all applicable factors, the Gates Commission only foresaw blacks constituting 14.9 percent of the armed forces by 1980.

A similar argument of those who would draft both black and white children, label them "expendable", and send them off to their graves is the argument that, even if we do not completely fill up the enlisted ranks, we will be the ones sent off to combat. That argument falls on many counts. First, the Department of Defense can control this if it wants. The Marshall Commission reported that in 1966, 22.4 percent of all army troops killed in action were black, but Assistant Secretary Kelley testified before the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee in October, 1969 that the percentage had declined to thirteen percent. Secondly, it would take a period of between one and two years to train and dispatch any recruits enlisted after July 1, 1971 by which time, if we are to believe what we are told, we shall have extricated ourselves from Viet Nam. And then, thirdly, with the President having to look to Congress, the People's Branch of government, hopefully America will not involve herself in any more conflicts without widespread public support and participation.

Of similar insufficiency is the argument that, if the armed forces were staffed by the poor and black, the general public would feel no empathy for the combat soldier, and effective protest would thereby be diminished. A volunteer army would allow the best protest of all, nonparticipation. Moreover such an argument is a slur to the conscience of all Americans, black and white, poor and rich. It presumes that we, the black and poor, would, in mercenary fashion, join up at a price and fight anybody for any cause. And it forgets the Viola Luozos, the James Reebes, the Michael Schwerners, and the Andrew Goodmans who, while neither black nor poor, gave their all in America's struggle for racial dignity. It underestimates the personal courage and selflessness such as displayed by Mr. Charles Palmer who, as President of the National Student Association, testified before the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee in 1969 and personally opposed the continuation of student deferments on the ground that they discriminate against poor and minority groups.

As in the case of the professionalization argument, the converse of the poor and black army argument is true. The simple fact is that, if the rejection rates do lessen, then the draft itself will put more and more black and poor men into the armed forces. The Marshall Commission reported that thirty percent of the eligible black registrants were inducted while only eighteen percent of the eligible white registrants were drafted. The draft, with its boards made up of only six percent black members and its grossly unfair deferment policies, will continue to create just the problem some fear the all-volunteer force will create.

Finally, with respect to the poor and black army argument, something must be said than just the mere recitation of facts and figures. The admitted detriment of the draft is that it is a form of involuntary servitude. The poverty which we, the black and the poor, find ourselves in today is but the result of a century's effort to wrest free from the vestiges of another, similarly vicious kind of involuntary servitude. It is completely digressive then to impose upon us one institution of involuntary servitude because, in our struggle for freedom from another such institution, we might find attractive a few crumbs and might, in grabbing at such, eat up a whole piece of bread.

It is just plain outrageous for a Congress, itself very unrepresentative of the poor and

black of this Nation to sit here and command that some black men, contrary to their own will and conscience, will have to fight a war that is not their own and die for a "freedom" which is not only not generally available to them but which, by the very process of their conscription, is denied them in order to assure that (1) not too many of their black brothers sign up and thus expose our impoverished home front and/or (2) that more white people are killed thus fabricating a sense of equality. Black men may have at one time sought refuge in the military, but today we are learning where our true battleground is, and you can be assured that is where we will fight.

Finally, alternatives such as national service will not help. There are not the facilities existent to involve the thousands of young people who would rather make peace than war. This is because the Nation has not reached the questions of conscience that her young people have reached. The result then of a national service program would be the use of our nation's talented young as hospital orderlies or government building janitors, with no lessening of the infringement on individual liberty that the draft now causes.

In summary, let me say that it seems that some well-intentioned people have taken their eyes off the prize. They are seeking to deal with symptoms and not causes. Rather than avoid a professional, militaristic army by cutting the defense budget at the right spots, and shrinking the Pentagon, they seek to provide civilian control of the military by continuing to force nineteen year olds into the lowest levels. The simple truth is that you do not correct one injustice by creating or perpetuating another. The draft must be abolished, militarism must be eliminated, and poverty and racial injustice must be eradicated.

I extend to you my gratitude for the opportunity to present these remarks today and prayerfully await the results of your consideration.

U.S. OPTIONS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is much confusion in the public mind about United States policy toward southern Africa and the role the United States is playing or ought to play in that troubled and controversial area of the world.

Some critics of our foreign policy have charged that we have been following a course of economic expediency in our relations with the white-controlled regimes of southern Africa, while others feel we have moved too far in the opposite direction—in a futile and injudicious attempt to appease black African nationalist opinion. The question repeatedly is asked: What are our real interests in southern Africa—that is, both narrowly and broadly defined—and what do we really expect to accomplish there? Are our objectives realistic or based largely on wishful thinking?

A number of answers have been provided with unusual clarity and forcefulness by Assistant Secretary of State David Newsom in a recent address he delivered at Northwestern University, sponsored by the African studies program.

Mr. Newsom advances four possible approaches to southern Africa and then proceeds to reject three of them as impractical, imprudent or both. His conclusions are based on thoughtful analysis and a sensitive awareness of a highly complex set of historical circumstances and contemporary attitudes, which often work at cross purposes and frustrate progress.

As Mr. Newsom points out:

There is no simple analysis nor simple point of view. Attitudes depend largely on where you are.

Another observation might be that it is far easier to advocate justice than to devise and implement a course of action which will actually serve to promote it.

Mr. Speaker, I place before my colleagues the full text of Mr. Newsom's address, entitled "United States Options in Southern Africa," and commend it to the sober reflection of all Members of this body. The address follows:

UNITED STATES OPTIONS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

(Address by David D. Newsom)

On December 1 Beverly Carter, one of my deputies in the Bureau of African Affairs and a black American, and I completed a 1-month visit to southern Africa.

Our purpose was to see at firsthand an area of the world which increasingly preoccupies many in this country, in the United Nations, and in Africa.

Thanks to the effective relationships of our own Foreign Service personnel and to the facilities and assistance given us by the governments of the countries visited, we saw representatives of every principal segment of society in this complex and tangled area. I should like to share with you tonight some of our observations, based on nearly a month of intensive conversations.

In the course of the month, we visited Pretoria, Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban, and two of the Bantustans, Zululand and the Transkei, in South Africa and Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana, Zambia, and Malawi. We did not visit Rhodesia, although there were echoes of this problem in nearly every stop.

As in any troubled and controversial area of the world, southern Africa is seen from a variety of perspectives. There is no simple analysis nor simple point of view. Attitudes depend largely on where you are.

The greater part of the white population of South Africa, and presumably Rhodesia as well, seeks to preserve the status quo. Although still consciously divided themselves between the Afrikaaner and the English-speaking groups, they emphasize that they built their country and that they mean to remain supreme within it. Many have convinced themselves that the solution lies in separate development through the creation of so-called Bantustan homelands and that this is the path the African, too, prefers. Even a brief visitor to South Africa, however, cannot help wondering whether the bulk of the white population really knows what the African wants or thinks.

The sensitivity of many of the whites with whom we spoke, however, suggests a basic lack of confidence in the future. No doubt many are uncertain; many are afraid. There are clear voices expressing doubts about the path they have chosen. Others, more assuredly, believe things would be all right, if it were not for outside interference, if it were not for communism and terrorism. Yet combined with this is an almost desperate desire at times to be accepted by the world and a sometimes plaintive lack of understanding why the world will not accept South Africa as it is.

The businessman, both South African and foreign, has a slightly different perspective. South Africa is a rich land, a land of tremendous potential, both for trade and investment. Some of our own businessmen in South Africa resent the restraint which they feel our official policy puts on their activities. Yet one has the feeling that businessmen and industrialists in South Africa are now themselves coming face to face with a dilemma built into the system.

There is an increasing shortage of white labor for key jobs. Can the ceilings imposed by apartheid on the use of black Africans in industry and business be raised without undermining apartheid itself? The question is debated constantly, in meetings, at social gatherings, in the press. Similarly, to make separate development work, the Government has placed restrictions on the influx of new black labor into the urban areas. Yet the expansion business wants in these areas cannot proceed without such labor. The perspective of business in South Africa today is one of dilemma. As members of the white community they do not want to move away from apartheid. As businessmen they cannot expand without relaxing some of the present bonds.

ATTITUDE OF URBAN NON-WHITES

The African about whom most whites in South Africa speak initially is the rural African. The policy of separate development is essentially conceived on the assumption that African labor is, or should be, migratory, coming from tribal homelands where they and their families live and remaining citizens of these homelands though they may work elsewhere. It is this African, in the mines, in the farms, in the border industries, who may find his lot improving, who may be prepared to work within the system. But with the passage of time, these Africans become "urbanized" and their attitudes change, in part because thousands are separated from their families by laws which force most dependents to remain in the African homelands.

Left out of this equation is this urban third of the African population, the Colored, and the Indian. One cannot help feeling that these represent the heart of the problem in South Africa.

It was in talks we had with representatives of these groups that we felt the greatest bitterness, the greatest frustration. Among these groups are the most educated, the most articulate of the non-whites. Some have done very well economically. But as they rise in the economic scale, they feel all the more strongly the restrictions and inequities, particularly of petty apartheid, which means the continued indignity of separate doors, park benches, beaches, buses, restrooms, ad infinitum.

I was struck by the fact that for this group there is retrogression rather than progression on the racial issue. As the South African Government moves to implement separate development by making every African a citizen of a Bantustan, those Africans who were born in the urban areas are losing rights they had before: rights to own homes, to keep their families in the area, rights to be South African citizens as they obviously want to be.

So it is, too, with the Colored in the Cape. Next year there will no longer be Colored members in the Cape Town City Council. Coloreds are being moved from the center of Cape Town to sand flats several miles away. Colored students at Cape Town University are becoming fewer and fewer.

VARYING VIEWS OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA

The perspective of Africans outside the Republic varies. Immediately apart, yet hemmed in, are those in the former British High Commission territories of Swaziland, Lesotho, and Botswana. Heavily dependent upon South Africa economically, these states nevertheless are successfully maintaining their in-

dependence. In the case of both Swaziland and Botswana, the dependence is being lessened as their own economies improve. Lesotho, completely surrounded by South Africa, is in a more difficult position. The perspective of each of these states, however, is one of realism combined with a desire to preserve the nonracial character of their own societies.

Malawi, greatly dependent on the economic return from Malawi labor employed in both Rhodesia and South Africa, has established diplomatic relations with the Republic and seeks to maintain a dialogue. President Banda believes sincerely this is the best course for his country, as well as for other African countries.

The states to the north across the Zambesi, Zambia and Tanzania, are the most militant in their attitude. Being former British-administered territories, they feel a particular sensitivity about what they regard as the failure of the British to bring majority rule to Rhodesia or South Africa. They harbor the headquarters of the liberation movements and colonies of refugees and feel a political responsibility to both. Nevertheless, their perspective contains an element of realism and a desire for a nonviolent resolution which they embodied in the Lusaka Manifesto of a year ago. That perspective is dimming, however, as the months pass without any appreciable response to that document.

A WORLD PROBLEM

Our own perspective, as many in this audience know, is mixed. Many of our citizens feel that South Africa's problems are its own; we should leave them to work them out. They are conscious that we have our own problems and are perhaps not in the best position to talk to others. There are a few of our citizens who view the white domination in southern Africa with a certain nostalgia.

Yet, whether we like it or not, we are involved in the problem of southern Africa because it has become a world problem. The southern African problem in its many forms preoccupies the United Nations. More and more of our own citizens, both black and white, share the feelings of those in the third world against the continuation of practices and policies based solely on the color of a man's skin. While there is debate on either the possibility or the imminence of violence in southern Africa, we cannot rule this out. And a violent confrontation between white and black in southern Africa would have an impact on our own society.

For those in our society concerned with our position in the world, the opportunity afforded the Soviets and Chinese by continued stalemate in southern Africa cannot be ignored. Their inroads in central Africa are perhaps not solely related to African frustrations over southern Africa, but these frustrations are a major element.

There is a tendency on the part of many in South Africa and in our own and other countries to discuss this area by analogy. Why should we pressure the South Africans to change when there is racial discrimination in other parts of Africa? Why should we pressure Rhodesia and ignore Czechoslovakia? It is hard to see the relevance of such argumentation. The fact is that a situation of legal discrimination on the basis of race exists in southern Africa. This discrimination is an affront to the newly independent African as well as the Asian. It is an affront to the black citizens, as well as to many whites, in our own country. It is a problem constantly before the world and the United Nations. It has within it the seeds of violent explosion which could make it an even graver dilemma for us and the world.

FOUR POSSIBLE APPROACHES

Against this background, let us examine the various approaches suggested to us and other concerned nations.

The first we might call *acceptance*. South Africa's problem is its own. We have our own; we should not meddle in others. Let us accept it as it is, have normal relations with it, benefit from its economic possibilities. It is, moreover, anti-Communist; we should put our chips on it in the global struggle.

No American government has accepted this approach. We cannot do so and be consistent with our own efforts to solve the dilemma of prejudice. We cannot do so and maintain our bona fides with even the moderate African governments. We cannot effectively provide alternatives to Communist efforts in black Africa if we isolate ourselves with the white-dominated enclaves of southern Africa.

The second option might be called *liberation*. This calls for support for the liberation movements directed against the present regimes in white-dominated southern Africa. It has been manifested in the recent controversial decision of the World Council of Churches. It has been an issue in the recent meeting of the African Studies Association. It appeals to many who see no other alternative and who are concerned that, in the absence of Western support, the liberation movements will find help only from the Communist countries.

This is the road to violence. Many of those who are in the liberation movements are undoubtedly conscientious, capable men, frustrated by the lack of progress at home. Undoubtedly there are others who find in the movements more of a political than a military base. But even a sympathetic observer finds it difficult to see this path as being either right or effective.

More than any other acts of pressure against South Africa, those directly related to support for the liberation movements have the effect of increasing the fear and determination which lie at the base of the resistance of the white community to change. Given the formidable security and military power of South Africa and Rhodesia, it is difficult to see success for these groups within the foreseeable future. Armed intervention could well set back rather than advance progress toward change. As a Government, however much we might understand the frustrations leading to the espousal of the liberation approach, we cannot find in it a realistic or supportable solution.

A third approach is *isolation*. This approach suggests the breaking of diplomatic relations, the withdrawal of investment, the further isolation of South Africa in sports, communication, trade, and finance.

This is questionable, even if workable. United States investment in South Africa represents only 16 percent of their foreign investment. Even if it were possible to obtain congressional authority to force its withdrawal, an unlikely prospect, there is no assurance that its place would not be taken by other investors. Neither is it a foregone conclusion that U.S. investment in South Africa necessarily helps apartheid; it is also a factor in the economic pressure on apartheid which I mentioned earlier. The South African, particularly the Afrikaner, is a determined, resolute man. There is no assurance that he would respond constructively to the pressure of total isolation. Further, such isolation would isolate also the African; not many of them want this.

There is a fourth option: *communication*.

The visitor to South Africa is impressed by the grave lack of communication among the principal elements of the scene in that area. White does not talk to urban black in any meaningful way. South Africa does not talk to black Africa, except in a limited way. Similarly, in black Africa there is an imprecise knowledge of current South Africa and the attitudes and circumstances of both black and white.

Several results flow from this.

The South African leaders give the visitor

the impression that they do not really know what Africans in South Africa are thinking. The articulate African is afraid to say what he thinks for fear of being banned.

More militant voices shut off communication by viewing with suspicion any South African permitted to leave and to return to his country; this does a disservice to many courageous people. In our own country, there is a tendency to refuse to listen to those who know the realities of South Africa.

Black African countries shy away from diplomatic relations with South Africa, unaware that many black South Africans would warmly welcome such relations as a window to the north. Competent, active African diplomats in South Africa would press and test the system in a way which South Africa itself is inviting.

White South Africans have a very impressive view of black Africa. They remember the Congo of the early sixties. They do not understand what has happened since. Their view of the African is the rural tribesman. Few South Africans have seen at firsthand the impressive educated, articulate African who is the product of independent Africa. In a lunch with faculty members at Stellenbosch University, only one out of 10 had read the *Lusaka Manifesto*.

The South African is sensitive about the approach he himself has devised: the approach of separate development. He is sensitive to questions which challenge the sincerity of his approach. Why, for example, is there as much apartheid in the Bantustans as there is in the rest of the country? Why are the cities in the Bantustans decreed white?

Communication can bring people to ask themselves questions. A Cape Argus editorial before Mr. Carter and I left South Africa mentioned that we had obviously not been persuaded that the separate development approach was correct. It asked whether they, the South Africans, should not take another look.

Communication does not mean acceptance. It means, in a sense, a greater challenge than isolation. It does not mean departing from the arms embargo, from the refusal to submit to apartheid in any of its forms, from our continued expression of abhorrence for the system. It could mean that each side knows better what the other is talking about. It could mean that greater hope could be given to both whites and blacks in South Africa who seek another way.

Admittedly, I have entered a controversial and emotionally charged area. These are thoughts based on experience throughout Africa and a brief but intense visit to the south. They are thoughts expressed with the feeling that other ways will less effectively bring the day which those concerned with this issue seek: the day when the black in South Africa as well as in the rest of Africa can walk with his head upright and have a role in the determination of his own and his nation's destiny.

EFFORT TO CLEAR VICE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Stanley A. Cmich of Canton, Ohio, my hometown, is winning a well-deserved reputation as one of the most capable city executives in the country, and I wish to include with my remarks, on behalf of Senator TART and myself, a feature story from the Plain Dealer of Cleveland reporting his achievements.

Mayor Cmich was in the city today to testify before the Special Subcommittee on Labor on various bills to establish public service employment. His suggestions should be of great help to the committee in its work.

The mayor pointed out, and I agree entirely, that any arbitrary requirement of a high-level unemployment rate as a condition of eligibility for a public service employment program undermines the potential of such program. In his city and in my district generally, the unemployment rate now is between 4.5 percent and 5 percent. The people whose unemployment raises our figure above 3 percent are temporarily unemployed but skilled persons. We need public service employment for the people who make up the initial 3 percent, and who need work and training that may enable them to move out of welfare and into permanent jobs, either public service or in the private sector. I think this is a vital consideration.

I include the Plain Dealer article as follows:

CMICH KILLED CANTON VICE, ATTACKS TAX (By John L. Koshar)

CANTON—Mayor Stanley A. Cmich is a hard-driving, two-fisted dynamo widely acclaimed for stamping out vice and corruption in this once notorious "Little Chicago." Now Mayor Cmich (pronounced Kamick) is making headlines of another type.

In an age when the average property owner seems doomed to more and bigger real estate taxes, Cmich has come up with a startling proposal to lower property assessments here in this Stark County city of some 109,000 persons.

The 54-year-old Republican has asked City Council not to put a .5-mill recreation levy on the May 4 ballot for a renewal vote.

THE LEVY, IN EFFECT HERE for many years, produces about \$180,000 a year in tax receipts. It is due to expire at the end of this year.

Cmich said the city does not really need the money from the levy because the recreation department is going to be merged with the park department, effecting savings which will offset the tax loss.

"It's not fair to the taxpayer for us (in government) to hang onto everything we can get," Cmich declared.

"The people must have the feeling that somebody in government really does care about them," he added.

"WE HAVE TO BRING a new image to the people that government does more than just spend the taxpayers' money," Cmich observed.

Merging of the two departments, now operating out of two different locations with separate supervisors, personnel and equipment, would eliminate duplication of certain activities, cut the need for some supervisors and other personnel and produce more efficient service with less equipment.

He pointed out that merger of the departments, scheduled for next Jan. 1, would make the city eligible for more federal funds to pay summer recreation personnel salaries.

This, alone, Cmich said, would cut 40% of the cost of the recreation program to the city.

If any city workers are displaced by the merger, they probably would be absorbed by other departments, he said.

"But in a word," Cmich commented, "we have to automate, just like industry. The taxpayers don't care how many people I've got on the payroll. They want more and better service for a better price."

Cmich, who has no doubts that council will take advantage of the chance to cut

taxes, says this may only be the first step in his attack on property assessments.

"We will re-evaluate all of our tax structure, and, wherever we can give relief, we will."

Cmich, now completing his third term as mayor, contends that since money from certain taxes can only be used for certain specified purposes, taxpayers must be given relief from taxes in some other areas, if possible.

"Besides, I foresee an increase in costs in other areas of government, such as in water pollution control," he said. "So, I don't see any need to add to the tax burden by hanging onto levies that we don't need."

Cmich had served two two-year terms as mayor when he was elected by a record margin of more than 18,000 votes to his first four-year term in 1967.

"I didn't have to cut taxes before to get elected," Cmich said, "and I don't have to do it now." He is uncontested for the Republican mayoralty nomination May 4.

Cmich has already won council approval of a 1971 operating budget that is lower than last year's budget.

The lower operating budget, another novelty in present-day, inflationary government operations, was the first ever submitted by Cmich, who said it was prompted by a \$285,000 general fund surplus from 1970.

Cmich claims his administration has had a surplus each year of about \$300,000, but he said 1971 is the first year "we felt we can live with a budget cut."

The former Canton safety director explained that annual surpluses are the result of preparing each year's budget based on a deliberate, anticipated 6% drop in income tax receipts.

But this has never occurred, even during last year's rise in unemployment. So the city comes out financially ahead each year.

Cmich, a native of Pennsylvania and a former Cleveland resident, came to Canton about 25 years ago as district liquor enforcement agent for the state.

A twice-wounded veteran of World War II, Cmich won the attention of former Mayor Carl F. Wise for his reputation as a hard-hitting "untouchable" in the liquor department. Wise appointed him safety director in 1952.

Cmich spent six years in that post, leading in the war here against prostitution and gambling, bringing an "All-American City" award to Canton soon afterward.

Cmich won three man-of-the-year awards in 1952 for his successful vice clean-up crusade from the Canton, Ohio and the U.S. junior chambers of commerce.

He resigned as safety director after Wise retired at the end of 1957 and went into private industry. But he accepted the GOP mayoral nomination in 1963, won the election and has been in office since.

Cmich's administration expects completion of \$100 million worth of projects in highways, parks, urban renewal and housing by the end of this year, plus another \$60 million worth in the next four years.

The mayor also aims at putting under construction early this year a \$28-million sewage treatment plant, plus a \$7.8-million storm and sanitary sewer project intended to lift a building freeze imposed last August by the Ohio Water Pollution Control Board.

Another aim is to take over the financially ailing Canton City Lines, Inc., after expiration of its public bus franchise March 31.

Canton's extensive parks system is to be doubled within the next five years, if Cmich has his way, with the aid of state funds.

In addition, construction of 60 neighborhood miniparks, measuring 100 by 200 feet in size, are on the drawing board, with at least the first half-dozen to be built this summer.

Cmich's pride and joy was his elimination of a \$100,000-a-year deficit in the garbage

collection department for a nine-year stretch prior to his taking office.

"We had to weed out some dead wood in the department," Cmich confided. "But we've added rubbish collection to garbage pickup, added 5,000 customers and have been operating in the black at no increase in cost to the taxpayers."

The city also is doing away with its 50-year-old traffic control system, after being singled out by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads as the first city in Ohio for a federally-sponsored pilot program aimed at encouraging more traffic engineering.

The first \$500,000-phase of the two-year, \$2.5-million citywide program was put into effect Jan. 8 in Canton's downtown area.

Canton also boasts a new type of radio-operated fire alarm system, which Cmich said is one of the few such systems in the nation. It was installed last year at a cost of \$350,000, replacing a 50-year-old wire and cable setup.

Does Cmich have any political ambitions beyond the confines of Canton or Stark County, like maybe stepping into U.S. Rep. Frank T. Bow's shoes when and if the veteran congressman decides to retire?

"I've had all kinds of offers and propositions put to me," Cmich concedes. "But for right now, I'm satisfied to stay where I am."

WOMAN TO WALK FROM MASSACHUSETTS TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I present some documents about a very moving story of a woman from my congressional district in Newton, Mass., who has undertaken a heroic walk of 45 days from Massachusetts to Washington, D.C., in order to protest the continuation of the war.

I present first the letter of this wife and mother, Mrs. Louise (Severyn T.) Bruyn of Newton Centre, Mass.

Following Mrs. Bruyn's letter is an explanation by her husband of the reasons which led his wife to begin this 45-day pilgrimage to Washington.

Following her husband's letter is a very touching open letter by Mrs. Bruyn's daughter, Susan.

Finally there is a statement of the Five Theses on United States Foreign Policy which Mrs. Bruyn desires to bring to the attention of every Member of the Congress.

I commend these documents to every Member of this great body and here salute the leadership, initiative and enormous generosity of this housewife from Newton, Mass., who has undertaken a long and lonely journey in order that she may somehow call to the attention of the American people the indescribable brutality of the continuation of the war in Southeast Asia.

I insert the following items in the Record at this point:

NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.,

Feb. 14, 1971.

DEAR FRIENDS AND RELATIVES: I feel I must write each of you to tell you my plans. This Wednesday, February 17, I am leaving our house in Newton, Massachusetts and walking to Washington, D.C. It should take about 45 days to get there. I may arrive around April 2nd, providing I make it.

I am moved to do this because I can no longer sit in the comfort of our beautiful home, knowing the death and destruction we are causing in another land. I cannot separate myself from this though heaven knows I am well insulated. But I know it is my money supporting the war machine, my senators and representatives in Congress approving war measures. People feel so trapped. I felt that I must break my own routine in order to make my protest heard. For me, this is what my action means. I am speaking as strongly as I know how. It is my deep hope that others will be moved to take some action which for them is right—as strongly as they know how—to end the war.

None of you needs to have the horrors of the war described. I know of no one who feels the war should continue. Many of you are already engaged in a total commitment to work toward peace. I am trying to reach those who have become anaesthetized and feel there is nothing one person can do. I am asking them to look for alternatives, to actively say "no" to the death machine which is war, in their own way.

In hope,

LOUISE.

Feb. 14, 1971.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: My wife, Louise, has decided to walk from Newton, Massachusetts to Washington, D.C. as a protest against the spiraling effects of the war in Vietnam and against the war itself. She is a housewife, a dance instructor at the All Newton Music School, a mother of teenage children, a person whose home means a great deal to her. I believe her protest is noteworthy because she is willing to give up the comforts of her home, her family, her artistic involvements, in order to make an action statement against the war; furthermore, her protest is one which should be communicated to those who have felt it impossible to be articulate about the developing holocaust in Southeast Asia.

Her reasons are simple. They augur a change in the temper of protest. The war has developed into a system of such devastating proportions that there is no longer time to debate its morality. The time has come for a fundamental kind of action which will bring it to a halt. It is the kind of action in which ordinary people who lead ordinary lives—housewives, businessmen, teachers, mailmen, bus drivers—can stop their routines and say that the war has become a seven year massacre. It can no longer be tolerated by any measure of humanity. Debate has ended. This must be the year of citizen action. If nonviolent means of protest are not exercised quietly and firmly across the nation to end the war—by halting work, by ceasing to perform housework, in order to engage full time in protest—then surely action as violent as that which the administration is perpetrating on the people of Vietnam, will take place. Ordinary, conscientious people must begin to take the leadership to bring this war to a forceful halt. Soldiers have been in our home telling us about the many My Lai's not open to public view. They have told us about the established practice of cutting ears and heads off Vietnamese by our own soldiers. The war is brutalizing American youth. Six million people have been forcibly relocated and close to a million people have been killed—according to our own Defense Department statistics. The massive air attacks on Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, the vast destruction of foliage and natural life with its horrendous radiation effects on the people and the genetic consequences to their children are morally indefensible. If China were moving troops into Canada in support of the Quebec Liberation Front, we would take extreme measures to protect this hemisphere from foreign invasion and ideology. Can China be expected to remain silent much longer? The American war in South-

east Asia must come to an end before extreme measures—a Chinese nuclear bomb with delivery power—enters into the framework of war or into negotiations. The German people did not do anything collectively and openly to resist their war and the atrocities perpetrated against the Jewish people. This inaction was condemned by the Nuremberg trials. In the United States, many people have debated and talked against the war but little direct action to stop the war has occurred except for the bombings of a radical few. These bombings have been called outrageous by the public when they are directed against buildings and the offenders are hunted down and sentenced. What a twist of morality!

The amount of bombings over Vietnam released by American airborne to kill, burn, and ravage the land of a foreign people averages 2½ Hiroshima bombs per month! The fact that the public should condemn rock throwing in store windows and at the same time support the administrative policy which brings massive human destruction is almost beyond belief! People then wonder why, after the futile attempts to change such morally outrageous war policies, youth turn to a rock or a bomb, or finally, violence against themselves with drugs. Where has the leadership of this nation gone?

My wife expects to leave next Wednesday, February 17th. We will miss her—but she goes with our full support and all our love. She will have the support of her friends in the area. She hopes that her walk will signal others to act nonviolently on a scale that will bring this monstrous policy of killing people in Southeast Asia to an end.

SEVERYN T. BRUYN.

NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.,

Feb. 14, 1971.

LIFE

Rockefeller Center,
New York, New York.

DEAR SIR: I write this letter to inform you that my mother, protesting the war in Indo-China, is walking to Washington, D.C. from Newton, Massachusetts. The distance is 450 miles and she is going alone. I have often asked myself how I deserved a mother like this. She is a beautiful woman, strong in her beliefs, and full of love and understanding. Yet, this war, she cannot understand.

Thousands of people have died without knowing why and yet we continue to further the massacres and self destruction to "save" the South Vietnamese. All we have been able to accomplish is to destroy a good portion of that same population which we are trying to "save". To decrease casualties, you pull out or never enter the war instead of finding new borders to invade. Thousands of beautiful Vietnamese children have suffered so incredibly because their skin has melted into grotesque distortions from American napalm. They could have lived normal lives.

We have protested, leafleted, signed petitions, and gathered in rallies. We cry for recognition—not for us—but for our country's mistakes. We are thrown in jails for getting exasperated enough to throw rocks, yet at the same time a soldier in Vietnam is being awarded a medal for killing innocent women and children. What has this country come to? Are we looking for a nuclear war with China? We must stop now in order to save the lives of husbands and sons who would have died in vain.

For these reasons my mother walks. What does she think it will accomplish? Perhaps nothing. But she wants people to realize that the war will not stop by itself.

My mother will leave February 17th from Newton and hopes to arrive in Washington, D.C. on April 2. She needs support. My love and prayers walk with her. I ask for your support to help her through this difficult journey.

Thank you.

SUSAN BRUYN.

FIVE THESES ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

In 1517, Martin Luther made public his protest against church domination by nailing ninety five Theses to the door of the All Saints Church in Wittenberg, Germany.

In this year of 1971, I make this protest against state domination by nailing five Theses to the door of the United States Congress. I carry this message written by my family and friends who support my mission.

LOUISE BRUYN.

We love our nation for its ideals but we condemn its war policies. We oppose the fact that we must support the war through our taxes or be forced to go to prison.

We demand that the foreign policy of the United States be directed toward creating the foundations of world peace and law. The following five Theses convey our beliefs about the imperatives of U.S. Foreign policy today:

1. The American troops and air forces must be withdrawn immediately and totally from Southeast Asia.

2. An international commission composed of major capitalist and communist nations should be established to aid Vietnamese people to develop their nation and protect the lives of all people in Southeast Asia.

3. A Study Commission must be created immediately within the United Nations to review its Charter, looking toward the establishment of enforceable international law and a democratically constituted world government.

4. International agencies must be created with the authority to allocate economic aid for national liberation and development, and to prohibit separate aid from stronger nations seeking control over weaker nations.

5. An international agency must be established to control the use of nuclear weapons and ultimately banish their national production for destructive purposes.

FIRE ANTS ARE POLLUTION— ERADICATION WILL RESTORE OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of programs to eradicate the imported fire ant because it is a hazard to the environment of man, domestic animals, and wildlife.

Fire ants are unnatural to the ecology of the United States and they are flourishing, primarily, because of lack of natural predators. They pollute by destroying the full- and free-use potential of farmlands, by attacking and killing almost all forms of ground-nesting bird-life, and by posing a constant threat to all persons who chance upon them in forest or field.

In this regard, I would like to call special attention to an article in the February issue of *Forest Farmer* which discusses some of the aspects of this problem.

I include the article as follows:

WHAT WE ARE DOING ABOUT THE FIRE ANT SCOURGE

A bizarre silence about the hollow post where a pair of bluebirds nest every year was the first thing to alert cattleman J. J. Gandy that all was not well. With sharp fore-

boding the Enterprise, Miss., farmer climbed to the songbirds' nest and peered into the tiny hollow. What he saw made him retch in disgust.

"I found the young birds dead in the nest," Gundy recalls bitterly. The egg shells were crumbled about the dry skeletons of the emerging bluebird chicks.

The killer? Collapsed shells weakened by pesticides? The choking fumes of industrial and auto exhaust emissions? Neither. The bird slayers were imported fire ants, pin-sized ants which invaded the United States from South America. "Thousands of the ants were eating the birds the minute they pecked open their shells," Gundy laments. Despite its cumbersome scientific name, *Solenopsis saevissima richteri* (most savage ant), the imported fire ant looks little different head to tail from native ants.

The sole exception is a tiny stinger at the insect's abdomen and the fiery cobra-like venom that puts man and beast to rout in the ant's path. That path so far spreads from Texas to the Carolinas, a total of 124 million acres in nine southern states. If unchecked, the tiny tormentors could spread west to California and north, according to some estimates, as far as Canada.

Not since the boll weevil and malaria campaigns has the onslaught of such an insect attracted so much attention. "Fortunately," one ant opponent notes, "the boll weevil attacked only cotton."

Unfortunately, fire ants attack everything. From fort-like mounds up to a yard high and only a few feet apart, the ants send out armies of some 100,000 foragers per mound, driven by an insatiable lust for the oily juices of anything alive. The gluttonous ant indiscriminately gobbles insects and spiders, dispatching them with a dose of venom from its fiery stinger.

And the ant's appetite has brought concern from knowledgeable conservationists in the South. In insect-laden regions of South America, fire ants find plenty to feast on and are kept in check by natural predators. Turned loose in Dixie after stowing away on a South American cargo vessel, they munch unmolested, leaving behind skeletons of ground-nesting birds like Gundy's songbirds and wiping out up to 15 important species of native ants.

Worse, notes Bill Fancher, long regarded the top fire ant expert for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, at certain times of the year when the ants require greater intake of juices, such as during reproduction cycles, and when the colonies reach such a level of infestation that local insect populations are wiped out, the ants forage far and wide for food. That takes them into the nests of quail to attack hatching eggs, rousting Texas' summer mallards from their nests in marshland, invading hen houses to attack newly hatched chicks, and sucking the bodies of squabs dry in the lofts of pigeon fanciers. Even animals as large as sheep, pigs and cattle are not safe, and the succulent secretions coating the newborn livestock lure stinging, chewing ants by the thousands, many times resulting in death of the animal.

Especially hard hit are quail and ground-nesting fowl. As long ago as 1932, studies in Thomasville, Ga., tagged the fire ant as one of the bobwhite quail's greatest enemies at hatching time, and more recently the ants have been accused of reducing the quail population of St. Tammany Parish, La., by 50 percent.

M. L. Kellum of Big Creek Quail Farm in Mississippi puts the figure even higher. "We used to have quail and rabbits everywhere, but now we have no rabbits or quail at all," he says. "About four or five months ago the ants began springing up overnight and now our quail are gone."

Kellum saved some quail eggs from one nest in a futile effort to hatch them out un-

der a bantam hen in a nest on top of a hollow stump. He checked the eggs closely almost daily. The day the eggs hatched, fire ants swarmed up the stump and killed every bird.

Were the ants only scavengers, coming along after something else killed the birds? Kendall Douglas, who operates a shooting preserve near Utica, Miss., would dispute that argument. "I noticed a quail running excitedly around in the grass recently, and I knew she had a nest close by," Douglas recalls. With a little exploring, he found the nest. About half the eggs had already hatched. "Fire ants literally covered every one of the hatched eggs," says Douglas. "We tried to save the birds that were still alive, but they didn't last more than a few minutes."

Joe Lagow of Anahuac, Texas, caught the ants eating fledgling mockingbirds in his backyard, a number of days after hatching. "I checked the birds the day they feathered and a day later all I saw in the nest was a big ball. When I poked it with a stick, fire ants scattered all over the place. All that remained were the skeletons of the four birds."

Even in death, the ants continue to claim victims. When massive fish kills began turning up in farm ponds a few years back, ecologists first blamed pesticides they said were draining from farm fields. Then the autopsy reports began presenting a clearer picture.

Inevitably, the bellies of the dead fish yielded the bodies of fire ants. In Alabama, the State Conservation Department said the deaths of bream were traced to newly hatched female ants which apparently fell into the ponds during spring mating flights. In Harris County, Ga., 25 pond owners reported fish kills. "The degree of fish kill appeared to be in direct proportion to the intensity of ant colonies," a USDA field worker reported.

In the latter cases, the deaths could be traced not only to winged females falling into the water but to ant colonies washed into the waterways. As few as four ants in tests killed a yearling bass.

What can be done about the fire ants? At first, it was hoped a predator might be turned up in the ant's adopted U.S. environment. Then, when nothing was found which could eat any quantity of ants and live, hopes turned south of the border in a bid to import some of the ants' natural enemies in South America.

A delegation from Alabama investigated. The members returned disillusioned and downcast. The only thing that kills the fire ant regularly is the even more vicious leaf-cutting ant which U.S. officials have been trying to keep out of this country.

The best hope so far appears to be a new insecticide bait developed expressly for the fire ant—mirex. But it's the treatment method that kicks the ants right in the Achilles' heel—their insatiable lust for oily juices. When mirex is mixed with soybean oil and impregnated on corn cob grits, the greasy concoction is irresistible to the ants. The reddish-black devils take the juicy chunks underground where they feed the first treat to the mother queen. In a few days after the juicy orgy the ants are dead.

The first tests with mirex were conducted in the early 1960s and to date more than 65 million acres have been treated with the insecticide. How safe is the pesticide? No one ever has shown the first case of death of a single bird or mammal from mirex used in the test rate, a meager 1.7 grams of the insecticide per acre, according to Fancher, who now heads the eradication program for Mississippi. Fancher says an animal the size of a dog would have to harvest all the mirex in 40 acres to be harmed.

However, when Florida's bird populations were reported to have declined in the mid-1960s shortly after mirex treatments, the insecticide was blamed. Mrs. Henry P.

Truchot, president of the Sarasota Audubon Society, investigated carefully, concluding that mirex was not to blame since the state's bird population decline was statewide and not limited to fire ant infested areas.

The Audubon Society official later won support when autopsies of the dead birds failed to implicate mirex.

JET NOISE—THE PROBLEM THAT CAME WITH PROGRESS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in an age where "environment" and "pollution" are household words, I feel that it is very important to look at all aspects of the issues that concern so many of us. In the February issue of "Mainliner," the monthly magazine published by United Airlines, there is an article entitled "Jet Noise, The Problem That Came With Progress." It is an article that sheds a lot of light on the problem of noise pollution and I wish to share it with my colleagues:

JET NOISE—THE PROBLEM THAT CAME WITH PROGRESS

(By Robert J. Serling, the Author of "The President's Plane Is Missing" and Other Aviation Books Examines One of Today's Environmental Dilemmas)

To some, the scream of a jet engine is a sound of progress—a brave, defiant, audible manifestation of the incredible power that has made jetliners the safest mode of transportation in history.

To others, it is about as welcome as the mating call of a lovesick dinosaur parked in somebody's back yard.

It is just as hard to reconcile these two points of view as it is to quiet the jet engine itself. But one of the chief difficulties is that the second point of view is held by those who generally cannot understand—or refuse to even listen to—the first point of view.

This lack of knowledge and/or tolerance is something the aviation industry has tried valiantly to overcome. Contrary to the angry and vociferous claims of certain noise protest groups, airlines, airports, pilots and aircraft manufacturers are not coldly indifferent toward noise complaints. They readily concede the jet is a noisy beast that can shake windows, disturb sleep, interfere with studying and spoil TV reception. And quite beyond this concession, they also have done something about it.

At the very start of the jet age more than 11 years ago, the airlines spent \$200 million for development and installation of sound suppressors. This figure did not include what it cost to operate less noisy engines—those admittedly inadequate early suppressors added \$10,000 a month extra operating costs per aircraft in the form of reduced power and higher fuel consumption.

A great deal more than \$200 million went into the adoption of fanjet engines which enable some of the sucked-in air to bypass the engine and thus travel at a lower velocity. Fanjets, or turbofans as the technicians like to call them, are noticeably quieter and some of the newer models—such as those installed on the Boeing 747 and the McDonnell Douglas DC-10—are an incredible 50 percent quieter.

Mandatory power reductions almost immediately after takeoff, the use of so-called "preferential" runways which take approaching and departing jets away from noise-

sensitive areas, and even curfews on jet operations after certain hours—all these were steps taken to suppress noise at its very source. Even more effective have been attempts to reduce exposure to noise, through land acquisition or condemnation, sensible zoning restrictions and construction of new airports away from residential areas.

The sad truth is that all these accomplishments have failed to placate those who persist in treating aircraft noise as a form of illegal pollution ranging from mere nuisance to wanton destruction of health and property. No one has ever added the total value of noise lawsuits filed, mostly against airports, but it must be astronomical; approximately \$6 billion worth of legal claims have been filed in the Los Angeles area alone.

It is difficult to discuss the merits and validity of noise complaints and their hand-maiden of outrage—the lawsuit. The airlines and airports are only too well aware that emotionalism is involved, particularly on the part of citizens who honestly feel they are being wronged in the name of technological progress. In some cases, they are—but in many more cases their anger is being directed against the wrong target. Ponder these facts:

In too many instances, real estate developers built homes close to airports knowing there would be a noise problem. In other words, the airport was operating before people moved into the area, in face of warnings that a noise problem would develop. Airport officials can cite case after case where local governments ignored pleas to prevent residential zoning on land in the proximity of airports. To cite one example: Inglewood, California, on the fringe of Los Angeles International, has filed literally thousands of noise damage lawsuits although the majority involve residences erected after jet service began at LA International. The same is true of New York's Kennedy, built in a relatively unsettled area 25 years ago but now swamped by residential noise protests.

Many builders have been guilty of shortsightedness by refusing to soundproof housing units constructed near airports. To cite Los Angeles again, only three years ago a quartet of big apartment houses was erected in close proximity to Los Angeles International and only one was soundproofed; from the other three have come bitter noise protests and lawsuits. There was loud public outcry when a school in the same area was forced to close because pupils couldn't study amid constant jet noise. Yet this school was built in 1955, a time when builders knew the jets would create a noise problem in less than four years and still failed to provide adequate soundproofing.

Unreasonably large and even totally phony damage claims by those trying to turn a fast buck out of the noise controversy have hurt home owners with legitimate beefs. The majority of court decisions in noise damage suits thus far have been against the plaintiffs, in large part because the claims were so obviously exaggerated. One of the principal arguments voiced by noise protesters is that jets have ruined the value of their property—a charge that consistently draws raised judicial eyebrows. Judges are most cognizant that land values in the vicinity of an airport soar instead of diminish. When Chicago's O'Hare was being planned in 1947, land in the proposed area was selling for \$400 an acre. In 1960, when the city had to purchase neighboring farmland for expansion, the price tag had jumped to \$50,000 an acre. The federal government paid \$3,000 an acre for tracts in the area where Dulles International was to be built. Land in the fringe of the same airport today is selling for \$20,000 an acre. Even more startling is the jump in land value around LA International—from \$250 an acre to \$250,000 by the time jet service began! It is true that residential dwellings close to air-

ports may drop in resale value, but the opposite is even more likely. A group of home owners near one major airport formed a noise protest committee, started legal action and finally sold their houses to the airport at a considerable profit. Most of them promptly used the money to buy up more property in the same area and started protesting all over again! Airport and airline officials can be forgiven a certain amount of cynicism toward noise lawsuits so patently based on hypocritical avarice.

There was, for example, a British survey which actually revealed a subconscious factor of fear as the main reason for noise protests. The British study involved persons residing near the London airport, and came up with the disclosure that the majority were not so much concerned about noise as they were about the possibility that planes might crash into their homes. The noise merely symbolized the proximity of the supposed danger.

There also is reason to believe that jet noise has been built up as a major annoyance and threat simply because it is a relatively new and different kind of noise. The Federal Aviation Administration a few years ago took scientific measurements of noise emitted from every type of aircraft using Washington's National Airport. The FAA itself was surprised to discover that some of the old piston aircraft were noisier than the newer jets, in terms of actual decibels. For that matter, jet noise levels are lower than those of noise sources which seldom draw organized protests. A four-engine fanjet only 500 feet overhead produces less decibels than a crowded discotheque jumping with amplified rock music. That same jet isn't much noisier, in fact, than such common items as power mowers, loud television and a combination of simultaneously operating appliances like garbage disposals, washer-dryers and dish-washers.

These comparisons, of course, are based on scientific measurement of decibel output. It is the scream of the turbine engine that seems to produce annoyance, and yet even here there is a decided element of emotionalism—or perhaps a kind of conditioned reflex on the part of people who assume they are going to be bothered even before exposure. The FAA found this to be true when it announced that jets would be allowed to use National Airport. It got violent complaints about "those damned jets overhead" on the day before jet service began. The same thing happened in the Chicago area when the Air Force announced that a B-58 Hustler bomber was going to run some sonic boom tests on a certain date. Weather caused the tests to be postponed, but the Air Force was flooded by protests anyway.

Public education about jet noise is a proven weapon against unreasonable resentment. In a number of smaller cities about to receive jet service for the first time, airline and airport officials well in advance of service inaugural met with citizens' groups to explain the noise problem and the industry's earnest efforts to do something about it. In such communities, there has been a minimum of conflict. These educational efforts, moreover, included briefings on the importance of air service to any city, large or small—something which few noise protesters realize or stop to think about.

A classic example was Chicago's once-busy Midway Airport, virtually closed a few years ago because of citizens' objections to jets. The area around Midway quickly became an economic wasteland. Ironically, the same man who headed the drive to ban jets from Midway later became head of a committee requesting the airlines to bring jets into the airport. He explained that his original opposition was based on emotional fears not only about noise but safety. Eventually, he added, he became convinced that the jets were even safer than the older planes and actually produced less noise over settled

areas because they climbed so much faster. This, plus the knowledge of what lack of jet service did to the Midway area economically, led to his dramatic conversion from enemy into supporter.

Those economic benefits are no minor element. An Air Transportation Association survey, using Washington National Airport as the subject, showed that 8,400 airport employees in 1968 earned \$78 million in wages, and spent \$6.7 million on groceries, nearly \$9 million on housing, \$3.2 million on transportation, just under \$3 million on clothing and almost \$1.8 million on medical care. The airport is the eighth largest employer in the state of Virginia. How much non-resident revenue an airport brings into a city is another matter, but it has been estimated that an annual influx of 300,000 convention delegates will mean nearly \$50 million additional income for local hotels, stores and restaurants. Those who would cripple, hamstring or even down airports because of noise seldom take into consideration the role this facility plays in a community's economic life—as Midway proved.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that reaction to jet noise can be extremely subjective and totally unscientific. In Van Nuys, California, for example, a noise protest committee obtained 40,000 signatures on a petition to ban jet service from the local airport because of the alleged harmful effects on a nearby school. Fortunately, the school officials themselves were fair-minded enough to run a noise study in which classroom sound levels were recorded while jets were taking off and landing at the airport. The readings showed the aircraft were producing lower noise levels than those obtained from ordinary classroom activities.

No one in his right mind would argue that jet noise is solely a product of (1) imagination or (2) greed on the part of lawyers and home owners. It is only too real and, in some areas, only too troublesome. And to be perfectly blunt about it, the present state of the art is such that the airlines and airports have done just about all that can be done in the way of noise abatement measures—often at enormous cost to themselves. Noise abatement procedures and restrictions at JFK, for example, have turned this major airport into virtually a two-runway facility which inevitably results in costly delays and diversions.

Nevertheless, the industry's fight against noise is constant and relentless. The newer fanjet engines going into the wide-bodied jets, as already stated, are dramatically quieter. Experiments are being conducted on new pilot techniques involving higher approach paths consistent with safety. NASA has been flying a 707 with specially modified wing flaps which permit an unusually steep approach. Boeing and Douglas are working on short-duct engine nacelles and also with acoustically lined engines—both promising developments. NASA is optimistic about using serrated turbine blades, actually copied from the common owl which has comb-like wing notches and is nature's quietest flier. Boeing is trying to perfect a new noise-suppressant inlet for its SST power plants.

All of this, however, is still in the experimental stage and by no means ready for immediate adoption. Even if a dramatically effective noise suppression technique or device were perfected, there is the problem of retrofitting the older jets. A short-duct, acoustically lined engine, for example, would require a \$1 billion retrofit program—an expense even high-ranking government officials have conceded is too heavy a burden for the airlines to shoulder.

Land acquisition around airports would be an ideal solution, but this panacea would run about \$50 billion—again, a questionable expenditure when weighed against the bene-

fits to relatively few people. The most important thing is for the public to realize that there is no single, immediate cure-all for the noise problem; no quick breakthrough, nor easy solution.

And of equal importance is public realization that overly hasty actions—such as unrealistic, unsound restrictions; bloated legal claims, and premature technological innovations—would provide a cure that is far worse than the disease.

The airport's value to the individual community, and commercial aviation's value to the entire nation, are very much at stake in the noise controversy.

COLUMNIST SMITH HEMPSTONE SUGGESTS INTERESTING WAYS TO PUT ONUS ON BAD DRIVERS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly disturbed about the drinking driver and the menace he is to life, limb, and property on our highways. We should not overlook any means of controlling this menace and I thought Washington Star Columnist Smith Hempstone had some interesting recommendations for "branding" all careless drivers, including the drunk driver. He made these in a column which appeared in the February 24 edition of the Washington Star.

I would like to call attention to this column which appeared under the colorful headline, "Zap the Highway Cong With Scarlet Letters."

The column follows:

ZAP THE HIGHWAY CONG WITH SCARLET LETTERS

Too much blood has been shed. The casualty lists grow longer daily. It's time for a cease-fire on this country's highways.

Our streets, roads and interstate freeways have become free-fire zones in which more Americans are killed each year than have died in six years of warfare in Vietnam. In one recent year, the butcher's bill was 52,500 deaths, 2 million disabling injuries and an economic loss of close to \$10 billion.

Fundamentally, the problem is that there are too many cars, many of them of unsafe construction, being driven too fast by too many drivers who are reckless, inexperienced or stupid, sometimes all three. Those to whom the bottle is no stranger add an extra element of peril for those who must run the automotive gauntlet.

Because the problem is a complex one, there can be no single solution to it. But a step toward sanity might be made by identifying the highway Viet Cong, the multiple offenders who terrorize our roads and make a commuter's mere survival a feat worthy of a campaign ribbon.

Recidivist traffic offenders who are nearly as great a menace to society as the felons who stalk our sidewalks, number in the many tens of thousands. They come from every age and ethnic group, every stratum of society, every occupation: Teen-agers, housewives, businessmen, laborers.

And they are at the core of the problem, make no mistake about that. The Automobile Club of Michigan, which recently investigated the circumstances surrounding 363 fatal accidents, found that about 25 percent of the drivers involved had been in an average of three previous accidents. Translated into na-

tional terms, that would mean that multiple offenders each year take the lives of about 13,000 people, inflict roughly 500,000 disabling injuries and cause damage on the order of \$2.5 billion.

Most states have laws on their books which give judges the authority to impose jail sentences or to revoke the licenses of those who have shown themselves to be a menace to themselves and to others. But the automobile has become such an integral part of the centaurian society in which we live that many judges are unwilling to invoke these penalties except in the most extreme cases: Lack of a driver's license may cost a man his job, or make it impossible for a widowed woman to shop for her children.

And yet it is clear that, if the multiple offender has rights, so, too, does the potential multiple victim. At the very least, he (or she) who has been involved in serious moving violations ought to have his car daubed with scarlet letters identifying him as what he is: A potential killer.

One way of doing this would be mandatory replacement of a car's regular license tags with conspicuously colored ones after the vehicle had been involved in two moving violations within a single calendar year.

Now there are some nuts, and I fear their tribe increases, who would continue to drive recklessly even if their cars were painted in polka dots. But it is a reasonable assumption that the knowledge his car bore red tags marked "Dangerous Driver" would slow down most multiple offenders, or at least give others a fighting chance by identifying him so he could be treated with extreme caution.

Highway terrorists with three violations could be given tags of another distinctive color bearing appropriate lettering. Such drivers would be allowed to use their cars only for getting to work and for essential shopping, but not for social purposes.

Since most cars are used by more than one driver, such a scheme admittedly would work a hardship on—and be unfair to—the safe drivers in a family. But the stigma of having to drive a car marked as a potential killer in itself could generate family pressures which might markedly reduce the burgeoning number of traffic fatalities. Normal plates could, of course, be returned to a vehicle after a stated period, perhaps 18 months, free of moving violations.

If a hard-core motoring malefactor were unimpressed by the restrictions placed on his license and his car, if he continued to be involved in moving violations, then for his sake and for that of others his license should be permanently revoked. An automobile can be a weapon as lethal as a submachine gun, and no man has an unalienable right to either.

The drunken driver, responsible for 28,000 deaths annually, has been a serious problem for years. With the spread of the drug culture, we face the prospect of some very bad trips indeed, for users and non-users alike. With a swelling population of 204 million people and 80 million automobiles on the road, the risk of allowing accident-prone drivers to carry on their fender-crunching ways simply has become unacceptable.

Thousands of people can be marshaled to march on Washington to protest American casualties in Vietnam. Yet it is one of the many ironies of our crazy time that nobody is very much interested in protesting against those reckless drivers who kill and maim thousands of their countrymen every year.

Each of us, if he is honest with himself, knows that he has driven recklessly on at least one occasion. But it can't go on this way. It's time to de-escalate the free-fire zones which our highways have become. And the situation has reached the point at which only draconian measures can be effective.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Georgia State winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, for the third consecutive year, is one of my constituents from the 10th district in Georgia. The speech was written by Mr. Kirk Reeves, a student at Thomson High School, Thomson, Ga., and reflects the true sense of responsibility and self-determination which built this country. It is people like Kirk that are the pride of young America and I would like to share his speech with my colleagues.

I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

The ceiling lights dim. The crowd grows silent. On the motion picture screen before us unfolds a story. We see a dark and dirty prison cell with no windows, no doors, and seemingly no escape. A bruised and tattered man is fastened to one of the four bleak walls by several sturdy, cumbersome chains. There is no way to know how long this man has suffered. Suddenly we hear footsteps and see another man. How or why he came is impossible to say. He moves toward the prisoner and begins to beat upon the chains with a hammer. Diligently, he slaves to free the prisoner; and, finally, the chains give way. Instantly, light pours into the room; and, the man who has suffered the insufferable, survived the unsurvivable, and lived the unlivable, steps into a world of light. The scars remain; but, before this man lives the seemingly impossible happiness he has never known. "The End" flashes across the screen in bold letters; and, the crowd begins to disperse.

Before our eyes has passed the story of mankind. Throughout ancient history mankind suffered and progress was burdened by the chains of monarchy and the suppression of freedom. Then, an idea, long dreamt of but long suppressed, came to the surface, thanks to the bold efforts of men in the history of the United States . . . the idea of freedom! Roger Williams, Lord Baltimore, William Penn, and many others all hammered at the chains of monarchy during the colonial days in America. Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, George Washington, and countless other people all dealt strong blows and led mankind closer to a successful democracy, during the American Revolution and the early days of the United States as a nation. Men tugged at those chains with documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, so that mankind might really know what he was aiming for in a democracy. Then, gradually, through great presidents and other political leaders, through courageous, military figures, through imaginative, inventive minds, and through outstanding talent in cultural fields, the chains of darkness, the bonds of servitude, and the burdens of monarchy were thrown off; and, the greatest, most powerful, most successful democracy the world has ever seen was born.

However, the dark cell will always exist. Those binding chains will always be ready. To stay away from that terrible pitfall, every American must use the abilities he has toward the betterment of our American nation. Indeed, every American should rejoice in the extreme privilege of being a part of the continuing American heritage—that of freedom.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to report that one of my constituents, Miss Janet E. Kronberg, 22355 Olmstead, Dearborn, Mich., has won the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Michigan.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest each year. This year more than 400,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme this year was "Freedom—Our Heritage."

I have read Miss Kronberg's speech and find it to be a well-thought-out document which exemplifies not only the responsibility of Americans but also the deep love that all of us should feel for this Nation and its precious freedoms and institutions.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the words of this fine young American, I include the text of Miss Kronberg's speech at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Janet Elaine Kronberg)

In the New York harbor there stands a well-known statue of a woman holding in one hand a torch, and in the other a tablet bearing the date of the Declaration of Independence. But there is another, perhaps less well-known statue, that of a woman who is blind to all prejudice, and who holds a balance and a sword. It is fitting that we think of these two ladies together, for they are sisters, and one is never found without the other. Any people that would be free must understand the relation between Liberty and Justice, and the relation of both to the people themselves.

I believe that there is a difference between Responsibility and Duty, and that a Privilege and a Right are not the same thing. A Responsibility is presented to an individual by God or fate or circumstance, and he must deal with it as best he can but cannot be blamed if his best is not good enough, for he has endeavored to the greatest extent of his ability. A Duty, on the other hand, is meted out to the individual by another human being or by the laws made by human beings, and Heaven help the individual who fails to perform it. Nevertheless, important as they may be, his duties should never be more important to an individual than his responsibilities. Similarly, a Privilege is a special advantage granted by society to some individuals and not to others; whereas, a Right is a sacred opportunity granted to every individual at birth by the laws of nature and nature's God.

The Declaration of Independence maintains that all men are endowed with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the boundaries of these rights being determined by that limit beyond which the actions of one individual infringe upon the rights of another. I agree; but I would add that these rights are not only the rights, but the unalienable responsibilities of all men. And when a number of people are united under one government, it is to the advantage of each and all that personal Liberty be maintained: first, be-

cause none is truly free under a state where even one is discriminated against; and second, because only in a state where he is truly free can a citizen contribute to the greatest extent of his ability. In all this we can see a hidden significance in the balance held by Justice: that the most perfect form of government operates under a system of both permissiveness and restraint.

One of the most precious resources available to the government of a free country is dissent. As a blacksmith plunges a red-hot horseshoe into a barrel of water to harden the steel, the people who are permitted to criticize their government can only temper it and improve its quality. For if their dissent is unjustified, the truth and the good qualities of the government will be revealed and may be appreciated. And if the dissent is justified, the truth and those characteristics of the government which need improvement will be exposed and may be acted upon. Dissent would be unnecessary only in a state of perfection, the complete satisfaction of an ideal. No country has the right to be completely satisfied with its government, and no people has the right to stop searching for ways to improve itself. Neither a perfect government nor a faultless people is to be found on this side of Heaven and the angels.

Freedom is precious. Freedom must be respected, or it loses its value. And a form of Liberty that tolerates the intolerance of some of its possessors toward their fellow men . . . that form of Liberty that grants to some the privilege to be inconsiderate of the rights of others . . . that is not freedom, nor is it true liberty . . . but a form of tyrannical self-hatred that suppresses the noblest part of every man who allows it to continue. For this reason, the boundaries of freedom must be sought, established, and preserved by any people that would be free. These boundaries are the laws of Justice, and they are preserved by the obedience of the people and enforced by the sword wielded by Justice for the people. Freedom of expression is the heart of all true Liberty, but Justice is its spine.

Justice demands obedience with her sword, but weighs her own laws carefully in her balance. Her sister Liberty holds high her torch, ever vigilant to the truths revealed by dissent, yet keeps always her reminder of the basic principles upon which our country was founded. Our American heritage of freedom is a series of checks and balances that serves to support, and is supported by, both Liberty and Justice. To claim his right to this heritage, a citizen must fulfill a double responsibility. He must obey the laws, but only if they are just; and he must be unafraid to demand changes, but only if they are needed.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, this week public attention is brought to the very fine contributions being made by young people who are participating in vocational agricultural education projects of the Future Farmers of America.

For the celebration of this year's Future Farmers of America Week, there are 536,000 high school students now enrolled in the national FFA program, which was founded in 1928 and chartered

by Congress in 1948. In my State of Connecticut, there are 17 chapters with over 1,000 members. The FFA forms a truly integral, not extracurricular, part of the teaching programs of vocational agriculture.

The FFA is used as a teaching tool for motivating, encouraging and developing students who are interested in agriculture and its related fields. There are seven specific areas of concentration which are offered in FFA programs. They are: Product agriculture; agriculture supplies and services; agricultural processing; ornamental horticulture; forestry; agricultural mechanics and engineering-electrification; and natural resources.

Thirty percent of the students enrolled in the FFA program go on to college level courses in their fields of interest. All students are given the opportunity to participate in job training programs and to gain practical as well as theoretical knowledge through laboratory work.

The Farmers Home Administration has joined the Future Farmers of America to sponsor a major project in 1971. The joint project, Building Our American Commum Communities—BOAC—will encourage and assist young people to become more knowledgeable and active in community affairs. The BOAC program, which has spread to all 50 States, seeks to help people in their communities through urban community development geared to the needs and desires of residents.

I am indeed proud to have five of the 17 Connecticut chapters of the FFA in my district. These very fine facilities are located in Canaan, Litchfield, Southington, Suffield, and Woodbury. The president of the State FFA is David Jacquier of New Canaan, and the State secretary is Alan Munson of Kensington.

The motto of the FFA is an appropriate definition of the scope and commitment which typifies student involvement in this important work. I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues with a note of praise for the gallant job done by the youth of America in the FFA. "Learning to do, doing to learn; earning to live, living to serve."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 52D ANNUAL AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the standing committees of this House has received long overdue recognition for its many accomplishments. I speak of the House Committee on Internal Security which, together with the Senate subcommittee dealing with the same subject matter, has been praised for its contribution to our national security.

In a resolution adopted at the 52d annual national convention of the Amer-

ican Legion, September 1-3, 1970, legionnaires agreed that HCIS and SSIS—and I quote:

Have clearly proved their worth to the Nation and its security by exposing, through their investigations, the working of the communist conspiracy within the United States.

It is with great pride as a member of that committee that I ask that the entire text of the Legion resolution be printed in the RECORD at this time.

I thank you.

Resolution No. 114: 52d Annual National Convention, The American Legion, September 1, 2, 3, 1970.

Committee: Americanism.

Subject: Support House Committee and Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Whereas, The House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have clearly proved their worth to the Nation and its security by exposing, through their investigations, the working of the communist conspiracy within the United States; and

Whereas, The current expansion of activities on the part of the Communist Party, USA, recent revelations by the Director of the FBI, and the decisions of the Supreme Court which emasculated the internal security legislation of the United States, have made even more clear the necessity for continued action on the part of these Congressional Committees; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Portland, Oregon, September 1, 2, 3, 1970, that it does once again express its confidence in the work of the House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as important instruments for the exposure and eradication of the communist menace within our borders; and, be it

Further resolved, that said Committees be urged to continue vigorously the work which they have so well undertaken in past years; and, be it

Finally resolved, that The American Legion petition the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to enable these Committees to extend and expand their activities.

WESTCHESTER COUNTY BOARD OF LEGISLATORS FOR REVENUE SHARING

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

On February 10, 1971, I cosponsored the President's revenue sharing plan as a way to get new money back to our local and State governments. These governments need additional revenues if they are to meet the challenges which confront them on a day-to-day basis.

Legislatures and public officials all over the country are calling on the Congress to pass the revenue sharing bill. In my home county of Westchester, the county board of legislators has passed a resolution calling for support of this legislation. I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues at this time because I think it represents the sincere

cries for financial help which are coming from all over the country.

RESOLUTION 59-1971

Whereas, the County Executive has in various forms drawn to the attention of this Board the increasing tax load upon the real estate of the County to a point where said load is becoming burdensome to the point of danger; and

Whereas, various remedies are being sought to relieve this load; and

Whereas, one of the most effective of the proposed remedies would be the revenue sharing bill proposed to the Congress of the United States by President Nixon which because of the fact that the Federal taxing powers extend over a much broader field than those of local government would be a much more equitable distribution of the load, now therefore be it

Resolved that this Board hereby approves the revenue sharing bill now in Congress proposed by President Nixon and asks the representatives of the County in the Congress to use all possible means to secure the passage and enactment of said revenue sharing bill into law, and be it further

Resolved that the Clerk be directed to send certified copies of this resolution to Senator Jacob K. Javits and Senator James L. Buckley and Representatives Ogden R. Reid and Peter Peyser.

THE PUBLIC DEBT CEILING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the administration's proposal to increase the debt ceiling to \$435 billion, it is shocking to review the reduction in privately held holdings of the Federal debt.

In 1946, the privately held portion of the public debt was \$231.6 billion. In December 1970, 24 years later, the privately held portion of the Federal debt is \$227.9 billion—almost \$4 billion less. In 1946, the public debt was 80 percent privately held. In 1970, the private holding of the public debt has declined to 58 percent of the total debt. It is patently evident that the percentage of private holding of the debt has plummeted in recent years.

Since the Federal Government itself and in its trust funds approximates \$158.3 billion of the \$391 billion debt or almost 41 percent of the total, it becomes apparent that we are drifting close to a federalization of the debt.

It is interesting to further note the "token" investment of commercial banks in the Federal borrowing. It was reduced from a high of \$93.8 billion in 1946 to \$59.8 billion today. On the average, commercial banks have invested about \$60 billion in the Federal debt throughout a 25-year period. The percentage of the debt investment of commercial banks has steadily declined.

In view of this trend, it is incredible for the commercial banks to continue to dominate fiscal borrowing policies of the Treasury. It is time for the public interest to dominate policies on marketing the Federal debt.

THE MORAL FLAW IN OUR
VIETNAM POLICY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Kingman Brewster, distinguished president of a distinguished university, spoke Saturday, February 20, 1971 about the moral flaw he sees in our Southeast Asian war policy. In his remarks prepared for delivery at the annual Yale University midwinter alumni day luncheon, President Brewster said:

To my mind the basic flaw in our Southeast Asian war policy is moral. Policy seems to be shaped and is most often discussed as though America had no concern for the sanctity of human life as such, as though we cared only about American lives.

The reduction of American casualties, even the withdrawal of all American combat troops, does not mitigate our moral responsibility: for the spread of the war; for the indiscriminate bombing of neutrals for the scorching of forests and villages; for the massacre of innocents.

Personal and national moral self-respect urge us to reassert that peace, the return of prisoners—not the Vietnamization of continuing American sponsored warfare—must be this country's goal. The issue, to me, is not tactical or strategic. It is the moral callousness of the assumption that the body count doesn't matter as long as they are not American bodies.

Mr. Brewster's complete statement is a major contribution to our understanding of the proper role of a university president in our present national crisis. I place in the *Record* the Sunday, February 21, New York Times report of the Brewster speech and the text of President Brewster's statement:

BREWSTER SEES A MORAL FLAW IN VIETNAM
POLICY

(By Joseph B. Treaster)

NEW HAVEN, Feb. 20.—Kingman Brewster Jr., the president of Yale University, declared today that "the basic flaw in our southeastern Asian war policy is moral."

The goal of the United States, he said, should be peace and the return of prisoners rather than the "Vietnamization of continuing American-sponsored warfare."

Speaking at the annual midwinter Alumni Day luncheon in Freshman Commons, Mr. Brewster said the United States' policy in Southeast Asia seemed to be shaped "as though America had no concern for the sanctity of human life, as such—as though, somehow, Americans cared only about American lives."

"The reduction of casualties, even the withdrawal of all American troops," Mr. Brewster continued, "does not mitigate the moral responsibility for the spread of the war, for the indiscriminate bombing of neutrals; for the scorching of forests and villages; for the massacre of innocents."

In an editorial yesterday, The Yale Daily News, the university's student newspaper, urged Mr. Brewster, who has opposed the war on numerous occasions in the past, to utilize Alumni Day "as a forum for denouncing the war policy."

A University spokesman said, however, that Mr. Brewster had decided on the subject of his talk before the editorial was published.

The editorial also urged Mr. Brewster to cancel a speaking engagement at Bryn Mawr College on Monday and to participate in a

teach-in at Yale that will protest the recent South Vietnamese incursion into Laos supported by United States forces.

Such national figures as Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General, Averell Harriman, a former chief negotiator for the United States at the Paris peace talks, and Representative Bella Abzug are expected to participate in the teach-in. It is being coordinated with a similar meeting on Monday at Harvard, where former Sen. Eugene McCarthy will appear. Subsequent teach-ins are expected to be held at Princeton, Duke, the University of Alabama and Notre Dame.

Mr. Brewster told the alumni he was sorry he could not attend the teach-in, which he said would "seek to point a middle way between stultifying silence on the one hand and self-defeating violence on the other."

But he added, "I would not want to stand silent when I feel morally distressed by our nation's policy."

CRITICIZED BY AGNEW

Mr. Brewster came under sharp criticism from Vice President Agnew and several members of the alumni last spring when in a reference to then pending Black Panther court action in New Haven he said he was "skeptical" of the ability of a black revolutionary to get a fair trial anywhere in the United States.

Later, at Mr. Brewster's request, the university trustees reviewed his work during the last seven years and unanimously agreed that he should continue as president of Yale. In November the trustees granted Mr. Brewster a six-month sabbatical leave as a "show of appreciation."

Mr. Brewster told his audience of about 1,000—alumni, their families and friends—that a "terrible tension" existed on the Yale campus amid a struggle to keep in balance the university's imperative neutrality and its imperative morality.

Neither dare be sacrificed, he said, adding that "Yale and all universities have a special responsibility to be sure that this country does not drift in a dead calm of moral acquiescence."

Although there was no sign of disapproval as he spoke—in fact, quite the contrary—Mr. Brewster said he realized that some alumni might feel that in his remarks he had engaged in "unwarranted politicizing" of Yale.

"To this I would say simply that the heritage of this place, a heritage which we all share, demands that none of us by his silence contribute to the moral erosion of our nation," Mr. Brewster said.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY KINGMAN
BREWSTER, JR., ALUMNI DAY, SATURDAY,
FEBRUARY 20, 1971

I hope you don't mind if I use these minutes to share with you my deepest immediate concern. It is not unrelated to what Time magazine headlines as the "Cooling of America." I do not feel cool about the present state of affairs.

There seems to me to be a terrible tension at the moment between the imperative of university neutrality and the imperative of university morality. This tension is not on the surface of campus life. So it is not reported. But it is seething within anyone who tries to respect the discipline of tolerance along with the urges of moral concern.

It should not be necessary here to recite the many reasons why a university must preserve a credible institutional neutrality. If it had a party line its pretensions to academic freedom would be impeached. If it had a party line it would not deserve the support of a free society. If it had a party line education would be warped into indoctrination.

On the other hand, Yale, brought into being by a strict theocratic society, should not have to explain why it also has an obligation to encourage moral judgment. This goes

deeper than the surface attributes of dress or style or even of private behavior. It is concerned with moral sensitivity and moral purpose as essential elements in man's education and development.

Yale men were not slow to find moral purpose in the birth of the republic, the confrontation with Hartford, the struggle to preserve the union, the war to end war, or the war for the four freedoms.

Today the great free university has, as one colleague put it, come to embody the "secular liturgy" of a society which goes to church only on an occasional Sunday.

If you believe as I do, and if you occupy the office I do, then you do right now feel a special tension between the claims of neutrality and the claims of morality.

The claims of neutrality make it terribly important that we should invite and protect the civil reception of all points of view. The claims of neutrality also require that any statement by the President of the university should make it explicit that when he speaks his moral convictions on matters of public policy, he speaks for himself, in his personal capacity, not in behalf of the institution.

But morality, too, has its claim. A college president cannot abdicate a responsibility for stating his personal convictions if he feels deeply about a matter which touches and disturbs his whole community.

At the same time it is terribly important for him to encourage others to do likewise whether they happen to agree with him or not. He must defend fiercely the opportunity for rebuttal and discussion. In a great university merit and reason must be the arbiter, and debate must not be rigged by official pressure or sanction.

As we come upon the Spring there will be no easy resolution of this tension between official responsibility for impartiality and official responsibility for moral leadership.

While I take great pride in the fact that Yale is a campus which can be receptive to all points of view, I cannot avoid the feeling that Yale and all universities have a special responsibility to be sure that we do not drift in a dead calm of moral acquiescence. Indeed, if it were thought improper for those in positions of public and private executive and professional leadership to express their individual convictions, it is hard to see who would be left to speak out for the private conscience on public matters.

Day after tomorrow a group of highly motivated Yale students and faculty members, concerned about the war, will seek to point a middle way between stultifying silence on the one hand and self-defeating violence on the other.

I am sorry I cannot be present because of a prior commitment to a lectureship in Philadelphia. I would not want to stand silent, however, when I feel morally distressed by our nation's policy. To my mind the basic flaw in our Southeast Asian war policy is moral. Policy seems to be shaped and is most often discussed as though America had no concern for the sanctity of human life as such, as though we cared only about American lives.

The reduction of American casualties, even the withdrawal of all American combat troops, does not mitigate our moral responsibility: for the spread of the war; for the indiscriminate bombing of neutrals; for the scorching of forests and villages; for the massacre of innocents.

Personal and national moral self-respect urge us to reassert that peace, the return of prisoners—not the Vietnamization of continuing American sponsored warfare—must be this country's goal. The issue, to me, is not tactical or strategic. It is the moral callousness of the assumption that the body count doesn't matter as long as they are not American bodies.

Some alumni may feel that for me to ex-

press such sentiments constitutes an unwarranted politicizing of their university.

To this I would say simply that the heritage of this place, a heritage which we all share, demands that none of us by this silence contribute to the moral erosion of our nation.

We will differ in our judgments. Whatever our conclusions or positions, however, all of us must speak out when we believe that national and personal moral self-respect are threatened by apathy or indifference. Universities, their students, faculties, and graduates have an obligation to prevent the moral cooling of America.

CHILDISH ADULTS GIVE US TROUBLE

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, having just recently qualified for membership in the 30 and over age group, I find it easy to identify with both the now and then generations.

I have long felt that one generation is not really so different from another. The youth of today may be slightly better informed, but as pointed out by my good friend, Sam Griffin, editor of the Bainbridge, Ga., Post Searchlight:

We have not seen any evidence to suggest that they are one bit more mature on an age basis in attitude or judgment now than in past generations.

Sam has reached a number of sound conclusions about the generation gap. He has taken the hide off those—young and old—who have not yet learned that certain responsibilities are attached to the rights of citizenship. His is one of the best articles on the subject I have been privileged to read. Therefore, I would like to share it with all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEMPTATIONS LOOK A COUNTRY EDITOR IN FACE

(By Sam Griffin, Jr.)

One of the worse temptations of being an editor of a country newspaper is the temptation to comment whenever one has an opinion. Opportunity helps create the conceit that one's opinions are worth sharing; and having the opportunity once each week to inflict one's views on any and every subject, the editor is not always able to refrain from temptation.

On reflection, this is one of the few temptations the editor of a country weekly has, and it is probably no worse than chasing women, gambling or carousing late at night. It is probably not as interesting, either, but one must make do with what one has.

While yielding to this temptation might not offer as much base for gossip as some of the other vices we have mentioned, we have found, in weekly columns over the years, that it can provide grounds for shouting at the editor for his audacity; for cursing him because of his obvious stupidity; for ridiculing him for his ignorance; and once, in a great, great while, for noting his intelligence because he has said something which agrees with the way you see things. We must conclude, on inspection of these points, that editors perform some function in society and might be tolerated.

With this preamble, we ask your indulgence while we speak some of the things on our mind, not from a position as a pretended expert, but from sincerity of interest.

IT'S NOT THE CHILDREN

Schools have been in the news for the past week or so, in one form or another, and some of the things seen and heard give one cause for careful reflection.

Last week, students in a school just north of Atlanta held a sit-in protest in order to force negotiation of some of their demands for some very trivial matters, and some which were entirely out of place in a place of learning. Their sit-in was successful to some degree, and administrators acquiesced to some of their demands. According to the news reports, one of the matters of contention was approval of smoking breaks during lunch.

In another area, the Senate approved an administration bill to set up voter registration of eligible students in the schools. Arguments of those in favor of the bill revolved prominently around the teaching of citizenship on a first-hand basis.

These things, among others, have caused the editor to think back, beginning with the premise of "when we were in school . . .", and it resulted in some conclusions we believe to be sound.

First, students particularly, and children as a whole, are probably not very different in attitude than what "we" were at the same stage. They are probably better informed on many matters, because there is a great deal more knowledge now than when "we" were coming up. On the other hand, we have not seen any evidence to suggest that they are one bit more mature on an age basis in attitude or judgment now than in past generations.

Reflecting in the past, particularly on misdeeds remembered, we can recall the same attitudes displayed by today's youth, especially concerning reaction to authority. We looked upon school many times as a prison where justice was unknown. We were convinced of the terrible waste of one's time and talents under the archaic tutelage of old fogies who were so out-of touch with the real world that nothing conveyed by them could be of any value. We were absolute in our belief that we could make a better job of the whole thing if those in authority would only step aside and let us get the train on the right tracks.

Youngsters today didn't originate the idea that today's generation is the most intelligent, most informed and most able generation ever; far superior to the level of knowledge displayed by their parents and representing the only true hope of the world. That idea has been the property of every rising generation from time immemorial and will no doubt continue to plague the generation known as today's youth. It just ain't nothing new.

If this is true, then what is accounting for the difference in state of our schools, our children, our students and our country as compared to generations ago?

"We" had many of the same attitudes as the youth of today, but we had a generation of adults who had better sense than to dignify childish dabbings as anything more than they are.

This is not to say that the fun-things of youth have no place. They do, but there must be a line drawn between the fun things and the serious things, and even youth must be taught to recognize which is which.

Bell bottom britches, shaggy haircuts, rock bands and headache music and many of the other items on the most-important list of our youngsters are only different manifestations of the not-quite-real world to which youth always has been and always will be entitled. Admittedly, some of the past mani-

festations have been a little more palatable in our opinion, but these things are still "for the young."

And that's where they should stay. Something is vitally wrong when adults ascribe to the trappings of youth and encourage the defilement of youthful trivia as matters of real importance. There is something wrong with a grown man who still wants to play cowboys and Indians and does so, whether he dresses like the cowboy or like the Indian. And there is something going wrong with a society which promotes children to play at the important and dead-serious responsibilities of the world.

We hope the taxpayers object strenuously to paying for school days in which administrators allow the students to divert the time allotted from learning to putting; perhaps they can best show school administrators which of these activities they are willing to finance.

We hope the legislature will decide that a better way to teach citizenship would be to encourage the student to get up off his foundation and go down to the courthouse to register to vote when he becomes of age. The student might just get the idea that there are responsibilities attached to the rights of citizenship; and that there is no obligation on the part of the state to seek his participation in his own government.

Maybe if today's adults cared a little less about being a part of the young generation and concentrated a little more on discharging the responsibilities of mature adults, youngsters would get a better picture of the differences in maturity and immaturity.

Long ago a man counselled others by saying, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

Today's children are just being children. It's our childish adults who are giving us trouble.

END THE WAR RESOLUTION FROM NEWTON, MASS.

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to attach herewith a resolution passed by the Newton Democratic City Committee on February 21, 1971.

This committee, under the able direction of its chairman, Mr. Robert K. Kraft, represents the more than 20,000 Democrats in the city of Newton, Mass. This committee and the city of Newton have been actively and intensively involved in the peace movement since its very inception in 1966 and 1967.

The attached resolve is but another manifestation of the desire of the people of this city and of the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts to disengage from Vietnam as quickly as possible.

The Newton Democratic City Committee, on February 21, 1971, unanimously passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Newton, Massachusetts, Democratic City Committee (numbering 280 members) on February 21, 1971, deplores and condemns the latest extension of the Indo-China war; and implores our Congressional leaders, our Senators and Congressmen, to support the McGovern-Hatfield Bill, as well as any other bill which would set

a firm date (such as that suggested in H. Res. 54 of July 4, 1971) to withdraw all United States troops from all Southeast Asia; and in advance of that, to support and bill which would prohibit United States air or ground support, advice and/or any other military assistance to the South Vietnamese troops now in Cambodia and Laos.

Submitted by,
CONSTANCE G. KANTOR,
Vice-Chairman, Ward VII,
Newton Democratic City Committee.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H.R. 17763, a bill to provide a nutrition program for the elderly, with the support of 111 of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans. I urge your consideration for the acute need for a national policy aimed at providing the elderly with low-cost, nutritionally sound meals served in strategically located centers such as community centers, senior citizen centers, schools, and other public or private non-profit institutions suited to such use. The program directs itself to the promotion of both the physical and mental health of the elderly through provision of balanced meals, education in nutrition, as well as opportunity for social contact to end the isolation of old age and the encouragement of greater physical and mental activities.

I wish to remind my colleagues that on May 28 of last year I honored Senior Citizens Month with the introduction of H.R. 17763. This bill received recognition throughout the country by all those familiar with the problems of our senior citizens as providing a sound approach to the needs of the elderly.

The legislation utilizes Federal, State, and local funds on a matching basis together with surplus commodity programs for the provision of at least one hot meal per day at a reasonably low price to the participant.

Typical of the enthusiastic response to the introduction of this bill is the statement of the Honorable William R. Hutton, Executive Director, National Council of Senior Citizens, during hearings on the bill, to the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. Hutton, testifying on behalf of the 2,500,000 members of the council said:

The National Council membership welcomes this legislation and urges its early enactment. We trust that the administration will support H.R. 17763 which is designed to carry out a major recommendation of the Panel on Aging of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health held in Washington last December . . .

The very first recommendation of the Panel on Aging of the White House Conference on Nutrition calls for legislation contemplated under H.R. 17763.

I commend the report of these hearings to the attention of my colleagues and

call particular attention to the testimony of the Honorable John B. Martin, Commissioner, Administration on Aging, the Administration's spokesman. The Administration admitted the need for better nutrition among the elderly and supported the purposes of the bill. However, the Administration put forth the notion that it is time to cease categorical grant programs. Even though the elderly would suffer, they must wait until a nutrition program could be provided for in a total social services scheme that, at some future time, may be accepted and implemented at the Federal level. Moreover, the entire program must then be accepted and implemented, in whole or in part, in the 50 States and four trust territories.

I question what would have been the fate of social security had this legislation been left up to the States. Would experience lead us today to abandon our national social security system and make the benefits dependent upon the action of the individual States? How long can the elderly wait while the administration ponders broad concepts of total social service legislation proposing to take care of health and welfare needs from the cradle to the grave? My bill would make it possible to stretch the social security dollar in the purchase of nutritious hot meals and I believe we need this legislation on a national scale to supplement our national social security benefits.

Furthermore, many of my constituents in Dade County, Fla., would, I know, be handicapped by the vast social-work superstructure of the complex and all-encompassing social services approach. I am sincerely convinced this group of citizens in Miami, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and the elderly in other urban and rural areas across the Nation would not be able to cope with the obstacle race that would be created in such a complex HEW structure simply to be able to participate in a hot meal program once a day in a social setting with their friends.

The administration spokesman also proposed there may be a need for more testing. I submit the categorical grant concept provides for continuous evaluation and improvement of the nutrition program and with the knowledge and experience already available from the research and development grants under the Older Americans Act. I question the necessity for delay of enactment of my bill for the sake of further research. You must feed the person first and then worry about other needs.

I support the ideal of continuing to integrate people's needs and to improve Federal assistance programs thereby enabling all Americans to share in the wealth of our country. I am aware too that man's inclination to identify with his peers brings forth in today's technological society important legislative challenges for all my colleagues who care about human beings—the young, the poor, the uneducated, the sick, and the elderly.

There are basic needs particularly unique among the elderly and these needs are immediate and urgent. These needs cannot be sacrificed while Congress or the Administration debates methods of ad-

ministration and funding on Federal, State or local levels. To sacrifice the needs of the Nation's over 20 million elderly while indulging in intellectual challenges of political science is unconscionable and I urge the support of my colleagues to provide for early enactment of this legislation in this session of the Congress.

I am happy to be joined by the following colleagues in this legislation which will be of such great benefit to our senior citizens:

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. DOW, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. FRASER.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mrs. HANSEN, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mrs. HICKS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEE, and Mr. KOCH.

Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINISH, and Mrs. MINK.

Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. PODELL.

Mr. PRYOR, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON.

Mr. Speaker, I include in this statement the text of this legislation which has stirred such great interest throughout the country:

H.R. 18814

A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is redesignated as title VIII, and sections 701 through 705 of that Act are respectively redesignated as sections 801 through 805.

February 26, 1971

SEC. 2. Section 102(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by deleting the semicolon and inserting a comma and inserting immediately thereafter the words "except for the purposes of title VII where the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture."

SEC. 3. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting the following new title immediately after title VI thereof:

"TITLE VII—NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY"

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE"

"SEC. 701. (a) The Congress finds that the research and development grants, title IV, Older Americans Act, nutrition program has demonstrated the effectiveness of and the need for permanent nationwide programs to provide the nutritional and social needs of millions of persons aged sixty-five or older who are unable to overcome the complex and intertwining problems of inadequate diets. Many of these elderly persons do not eat adequately because they cannot afford to do so, while others, who are economically better off, do not eat well because they lack the skills to select and prepare nourishing and well-balanced meals, have limited mobility which may impair their capacity to shop and cook for themselves, and have feelings of rejection and loneliness which obliterate the incentive necessary to prepare and eat a meal alone. These and other physiological, psychological, social, and economic changes that occur with aging result in a pattern of living, which causes malnutrition and further physical and mental deterioration.

"(b) In addition to the food stamp program, commodity distribution systems and old-age income benefits, there is an acute need for a national policy aimed at providing the elderly with low cost, nutritionally sound meals served in strategically located centers such as community centers, senior citizen centers, schools, and other public or private nonprofit institutions suited to such use and through other means toward this purpose. Besides promoting better health among the older segment of our population through improved nutrition, such a program, implemented through the use of a variety of community resources, would be a means of promoting greater opportunity for social contact ending the isolation of old age, increasing participants' knowledge of nutrition and health in general, and promoting positive mental health and independence through the encouragement of greater physical and mental activities.

"ADMINISTRATION"

"SEC. 702. (a) In order to effectively carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall—

"(1) create a new division within the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture, under the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services, for the administration of the program;

"(2) make full utilization of the existing services within the Department including but not limited to the Federal Extension Service under the Director of Science and Education; and

"(3) consult with the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to request the technical assistance and cooperation of the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation, and such other departments and agencies of the Federal Government as may be appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other

public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, personnel, and facilities.

"(d) In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized to provide consultative services and technical assistance to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State; to provide short-term training and technical instruction; and to collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials, including reports of the projects for which funds are provided under this title.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS"

"SEC. 703. (a) (1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under section 708(A) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, shall each be allotted an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum of such sum and (B) each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum.

"(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this title shall be equal to the sum of the amount allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reallocation, from time to time and on such dates during such year as the Secretary may fix, to other States in proportion of the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Such reallocations shall be made on the basis of the State plan so approved, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for that year.

"(c) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be available for grants to pay up to 90 per centum of the costs of projects in such State described in section 705 and approved by such State in accordance with its State plan approved under section 705. Such allotment to any State in any fiscal year shall be made upon the condition that the Federal allotment will be matched during each fiscal year by 10 per centum, or more, as the case may be, from funds within the State.

"(d) If, in any State, the State agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this title in the State, or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State, the Secretary shall withhold the allotment of funds to such State referred to in subsection (a). The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of such State in accordance with the provisions of this title, including the requirement that any such payment or payments shall be matched in the proportion specified in subsection (c)

for such State, by funds from sources within the State.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES"

"SEC. 704. (a) Funds allotted to any State pursuant to section 703 during a fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State for disbursement by the State agency in accordance with such agreements not inconsistent with the provisions of this title as may be entered into by the Secretary and such State agency, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, during such fiscal year in supplying—

"(1) agriculture commodities and other foods for consumption by persons aged sixty-five or over; and

"(2) nonfood assistance in furtherance of the programs authorized under this title.

"(b) The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"STATE PLANS"

"SEC. 705. (a) Any State which desires to receive allotments under this title shall submit to the Secretary for approval a State plan for purposes of this title which—

"(1) establishes or designates a single State agency as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for coordination of State programs and activities related to the purposes of this title;

"(2) sets forth such policies and procedures as will provide satisfactory assurance that allotments paid to the State under the provisions of this title will be expended—

"(A) to make grants in cash or in kind to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State (hereinafter referred to 'recipient of a grant or contract')—

"(i) to carry out the program as described in section 706.

"(ii) to provide up to 90 per centum of the costs of the purchase and preparation of the food; delivery of the meals; and such other reasonable expenses as may be incurred in providing nutrition services to persons aged sixty-five or over. Recipients of grants of contracts may charge participating individuals for meals furnished but such charge shall not exceed a per meal limit to be established by each State agency, taking into consideration the income ranges of eligible individuals in local communities and other sources of income of the recipients of a grant or a contract.

"(iii) to provide up to 90 per centum of the costs of such supporting services as may be absolutely necessary such as the costs of social services and local public transportation to and from the residences of participating individuals to the extent such costs are not provided by grants for these services from the Administration on Aging, Department of Transportation, Office of Economic Opportunity, or other Federal agency.

"(B) to provide for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan: *Provided*, That the amount expended for such administration and planning shall not exceed a sum which shall be agreed upon between the Secretary and the State agency—

"(1) in making report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this title, including reports of the objective measurements required by section 706, and keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and veri-

fication of such reports and proper disbursement of Federal fund under this title, and

"(1) in providing satisfactory assurance that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid under this title to the State, including any such funds paid by the State to the recipient of a grant or contract.

"(3) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan which he determines meets the requirements and purposes of this section.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds (1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this title, or (2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision or with any requirements set forth in the application of a recipient of a grant or contract approved pursuant to such plan, the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under the provisions of this title (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs or projects under the State plan, or portions thereof, not affected by the failure, or that the State agency shall not make further payments under this part to specified local agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to the State under this title, or shall limit payments to recipients of grants or contracts under, or parts of, the State plan not affected by the failure or payments to the State agency under this part shall be limited to recipients of grants or contracts not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under subsection (c), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"NUTRITION AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"Sec. 706. Funds allotted to any State during any fiscal year pursuant to section 703

shall be disbursed by the State agency to recipients of grants or contracts who agree—

"(1) to establish a program (hereinafter referred to as a 'nutrition program') which, five or more days per week, provides at least one hot meal per day and any additional meals, hot or cold, each of which assures a minimum of one-third of the daily recommended dietary allowances as established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council;

"(2) to provide such nutrition program for individuals aged sixty-five or over (hereinafter referred to as 'eligible individuals');

"(3) to furnish a site for such nutrition program in as close proximity to the majority of eligible individuals' residences as feasible, and, preferably within walking distance;

"(4) to utilize methods of administration including outreach which will assure that the maximum number of eligible individuals may have an opportunity to participate in such nutrition program;

"(5) to provide a setting conducive to expanding the nutritional program to include recreational activities, informational, health and welfare counseling and referral services;

"(6) to include such training as may be necessary to enable the personnel to carry out the provisions of this title;

"(7) to establish and administer the nutritional program with the advice of persons competent in the field of service in which the nutrition program is being provided, and of persons who are knowledgeable with regard to the needs of elderly persons;

"(8) to provide an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness, feasibility and cost of each particular type of such program; and

"(9) to give preference to persons aged sixty-five or over for any staff positions, full- or part-time, for which such persons qualify.

"SURPLUS COMMODITIES

"Sec. 707. Each recipient of a grant or contract shall, insofar as practicable, utilize in its nutrition program commodities designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the local area, or commodities donated by the Secretary. Commodities purchased under the authority of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, may be donated by the Secretary to the recipient of a grant or contract, in accordance with the needs as determined by the recipient of a grant or contract, for utilization in the nutritional program under this title. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe terms and conditions respecting the use of commodities donated under such section 32, as will maximize the nutritional and financial contributions of such donated commodities in such public or private nonprofit institutions or organizations, agencies, or political subdivisions of a State.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 708. (a) The Secretary may utilize the programs authorized under this title in carrying out the provisions of clause (2) of section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 774; 7 U.S.C. 614c).

"(b) In addition to any other funds which may be available, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"PROGRAMS EXPENDITURES

"Sec. 709. Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the authorization contained in section 708 of this title, not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall be made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, not to exceed \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, not to exceed \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants-in-aid pursuant to the provisions of this title, less—

"(1) not to exceed 3½ per centum thereof which per centum is hereby made available

to the Secretary for his administrative expenses under this title;

"(2) direct expenditures by the Secretary for agricultural commodities and other foods to be distributed among the States and such public or private nonprofit institutions or organizations, agencies, or political subdivisions of a State, participating in the nutrition program under this title.

"RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS

"Sec. 710. No part of the cost of any program under this title may be treated as income or benefits to any eligible individual for the purpose of any other program or provision of State or Federal law.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 711. None of the provisions of this title shall be construed to prevent a recipient of a grant or a contract from entering into an agreement with a profitmaking organization to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title."

A TRIBUTE TO A SCIENTIST-HUMANITARIAN

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, contains a tribute to that organization's president-elect, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg.

The article was written by Dr. Gerald F. Tape, a friend and colleague of Dr. Seaborg's on the Atomic Energy Commission and now president of the Associated Universities, Inc.

Dr. Seaborg's monumental achievements as a scientist and administrator, both at the University of California and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, are duly noted. But I was particularly impressed with discussion of his great concern for the humanities.

I am inserting Dr. Tape's fine words about this scientist-humanitarian in the RECORD:

GLENN T. SEABORG, PRESIDENT-ELECT 1971

Glenn T. Seaborg, the president-elect, has served science and has encouraged the utilization of science in the service of mankind for more than 30 years. His contributions have ranged from those of an outstanding laboratory research scientist, with accomplishments worthy of the Nobel prize, to those of the government public servant, who encouraged the use of science and technology for improvement of the health and economic welfare of peoples both at home and abroad. His vision has guided his own personal activities and the activities of others beyond today's problems; it has provided significant and imaginative goals; it has stimulated youth to become better informed and to understand the role of science and technology in the future development of our society. Glenn Seaborg brings to the office a wisdom derived from a variety of firsthand experiences—as a research scientist, as a team leader and director of research, as an educator, as chancellor of an eminent university, as a government adviser, as a high-level government official, and as a proponent of international understanding and security.

Although his career has been linked to science and especially to nuclear science, he has been prominent in other endeavors. His many writings and speeches, especially in the past 15 years, have reflected the importance

of the humanities. His personal interest in sports is well known to his associates. His concern for peace in the world through communication, understanding, and friendship is shared equally with his concern for national economic and military security.

Glenn Seaborg is recognized as a world authority on the transuranium elements. During the last half of the 1930's at Berkeley, he completed his graduate work with a thesis on the inelastic scattering of fast neutrons, served as personal research assistant to G. N. Lewis, became one of the now famous disciples in E. O. Lawrence's cyclotron laboratory creating and identifying many new radioisotopes, and, after the discovery of fission by Hahn, Meitner, and Strassmann in 1939, moved vigorously into the investigation of the transuranium elements. Starting with element 94 (plutonium) in 1940, he was codiscoverer during the next 18 years of nine transuranium elements. In 1941 Seaborg and his associates—including graduate students—identified plutonium-239 and uranium-233, the nuclear energy isotopes so important to future energy production utilizing breeder reactor technology with uranium and thorium as the respective natural resources.

In April 1942, Seaborg took leave from the University of California to head the plutonium work of the Manhattan Project at the University of Chicago Metallurgical Laboratory. He directed the development of the chemical process for separating plutonium from fuel elements irradiated in the Hanford production reactors; in the course of that work, he and his associates discovered element 95 (americium) and element 96 (curium). In May 1946, he returned to Berkeley as full professor and also became responsible for the direction of the nuclear chemical research at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

In addition to work on transuranium elements, Seaborg and his colleagues were responsible for the identification of more than 100 isotopes of the elements. Working with physicists in Lawrence's laboratory, Seaborg brought to the research endeavor a chemical finesse most important at that stage of exploration to the separation and identification of a large number of isotopic activities. Particularly significant, especially for applications in research and in medicine, are iodine-131, iron-55, iron-59, cobalt-60, manganese-54, and antimony-124.

Seaborg has emphasized the ordering of information as a forerunner to the development of theory and the subsequent prediction of new physical effects and phenomena. He was author of the actinide concept of the heavy element electronic structure, which demonstrates that the heavy elements form a "transition" series of actinide elements in a manner analogous to the lanthanide series of rare earths. This then permitted the prediction of hafnium-like properties for element 104 and the postulation of the chemical properties of elements of even higher atomic number. The information assembled in Seaborg's laboratory and by associates who have followed him has made it possible to predict the characteristics of many elements still unknown. Whole new systems of methodology and instrumentation have been developed under his leadership.

Seaborg was born of Swedish parents in Ishpeming, an iron-mining town in Michigan's upper peninsula. The family moved to California, principally to extend the children's horizons, when Glenn was 10 years old. Although several generations of Seaborg men were machinists and his mother preferred a commercial course for him, young Seaborg, upon entering high school in the Watts District of Los Angeles, chose a college preparatory curriculum. Having the good fortune to have an outstanding and inspiring teacher for high school chemistry and physics, Seaborg chose science as his future course of interest. Attendance at a university was pos-

sible only because of California's low cost higher education opportunities and a variety of summer jobs, odd jobs, and university assistantships that provided Seaborg with the wherewithal to continue his education. His years at UCLA further confirmed his interest in science. Although at the time he preferred physics, he believed that a chemist had a wider range of job opportunities. He chose the University of California at Berkeley for graduate work; the chemistry staff at Berkeley was legendary and the attractions of Lewis and Lawrence were overpowering. His association with Berkeley has been long and continuous, interrupted only by leaves of absence, first for wartime work in the Manhattan District and second as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

While devoted to science, Seaborg early showed other interests. At the University of California in Berkeley he served as faculty athletic representative to their intercollegiate athletic conference. His interest in athletics and his support of the University of California's athletic teams let him to undertake this added assignment. In the summer of 1958, Clark Kerr became president of the university, and Seaborg was summoned to fill the vacated position of chancellor of the Berkeley campus. His acceptance required him to reduce the amount of time previously devoted to his foremost interests of research and teaching. However, he continued, as an associate director of the Radiation Laboratory and continued to direct the research of graduate students. This was the beginning of a long period of administrative responsibilities, and yet Seaborg was able personally to maintain his leadership in his chosen field of science, to stimulate his associates and others to new research endeavors, and generally to provide a guiding hand.

Seaborg served as chancellor of the Berkeley campus for 2½ years. This period during the late 1950's saw important academic developments and a tremendous expansion of the physical plant of the university. His concern over the need to strengthen the humanities, to provide some balance with the sciences, contributed to the creation of the Institute for the Humanities. Interested in teaching and its need to be significantly strengthened, Seaborg became chairman of the Chemical Education Material Study (CHEM Study), a program that has revolutionized the high school curriculum in chemistry throughout the nation. He proposed the Lawrence Hall of Science, a facility in which research in science teaching and the dissemination of knowledge to the public could be carried out.

In January 1961 President Kennedy asked Seaborg to serve as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a position which he has continuously held, serving under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. The appointment of a scientist as chairman of the AEC emphasizes the role of science and technology in such an agency and the importance, which President Kennedy foresaw, for science in the government in general. This was not Seaborg's first role in the federal government, although it was his first as a full-time employee with operational responsibility for one of its major agencies. He had been appointed by President Truman in 1947 to the first General Advisory Committee for the Atomic Energy Commission, a position he held until 1950, and by President Eisenhower to the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) in 1959 and to the National Science Board in 1960, positions from which he resigned in 1961 when he joined the AEC. During his PSAC service he was chairman of the panel that prepared the report "Scientific Progress, The Universities and The Federal Government." In this document, which has become known as "the Seaborg report," the federal policy in support of basic research is spelled out, as well as the integral relation between research and grad-

uate teaching and the need for strengthening university advanced teaching programs. He was a member of the Commission on the Humanities, an activity which in 1965 led to the creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Seaborg has written many books and articles throughout his career, even in those periods when he has held demanding administrative responsibilities. Of the books that reflect his field of scientific knowledge, the latest is a two-volume work with Hyde and Perlman, *The Nuclear Properties of the Heavy Elements*. More recently he has treated a wide variety of subjects by hundreds of speeches to public forums, national and international conferences, academic assemblies, youth forums including symposia for high school students, and as president of Science Service, the International Science Fair, and the Science Talent Search.

Seaborg has served the Atomic Energy Commission well, and his position as chairman has permitted him to contribute personally to the strengthening of programs in science, education, national welfare, and international security. He has delineated the role of basic research and the need for extensive research efforts in universities, national laboratories, and industry to provide for the continuing understanding of nature, the impact of the utilization of technology, and the economic development of the individual nations of the world. He has stressed the role that energy will play in our lives and emphasized the development of adequate energy resources to satisfy the world's needs. He holds a lifelong view that science in our time is not an ivory tower and that scientists should bring their experience and special knowledge into the general matrix of knowledge from which decisions are made in a democracy that increasingly depends on science and technology. In many respects Seaborg has built a second career fashioned around the public aspects of science, one which closely parallels in time his service with the federal government and which is no less impressive than his research career.

Seaborg's activities derive not only from a motivation to be a participant in human affairs but also from his understanding of the impact of the scientific revolution on social institutions. For over a quarter of a century he has advocated the peaceful aspects of the scientific revolution, acting to expand and to strengthen science and technology not only for the achievement of ancient human aspirations for better material life but also as instruments for cultural and esthetic enrichment.

Seaborg's interests are reflected in the atomic energy program with its diversity of fundamental research and applications to national defense, to space, to human health, and to national welfare, especially in the production of energy. He has expounded the benefits and the risks, communicating with the citizen and with public officials on the national and international scene.

A determined and tireless campaigner for improved international relations through the flow of information, including visits by and exchanges of scientists, Seaborg has visited over 60 countries, touching every continent, during his AEC chairmanship. These visits have included talks with heads of states and other government officials, visits to laboratories, schools and universities, and speeches on specific scientific subjects. His recent most extended trip, a 1970 visit to Africa, opened new channels of cooperation between U.S. scientists and African scientists. His success in these endeavors is widely recognized. Many of his visits permitted constructive discussions with his counterparts of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which he strongly supported. He has headed the U.S. delegation to the International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference annually since 1961, was

a member of Secretary Rusk's delegation to Moscow for the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963, and was chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Third Geneva Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in 1964.

Seaborg's honors have been extensive and are far too numerous to list. Best known are the major awards for scientific achievement; the Nobel prize (with E. M. McMillan) for work in the chemistry of the trans-uranium elements in 1951, and the Atomic Energy Commission's Fermi award for work in nuclear chemistry and his leadership in scientific and educational affairs in 1959. The Arches of Science Award was presented in 1968 by the Pacific Science Center for contributions to the public understanding of science in a complex and changing society. He has been recognized nationally and internationally by honorary degrees and memberships in various academies and professional societies. An early indication of these honors to come was his selection by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of America's ten outstanding young men of 1947, a recognition of early clear-cut achievements in a specific field coupled with the promise of broader contributions to come.

The president-elect comes to the AAAS as a highly qualified proponent of science; an able practitioner of communication and understanding in the arts, humanities, and sciences; a firm believer in youth and the future of the world; and a gentleman sensitive to the views of others. His vigor and ability to fit everything into the 168-hour week will still permit time with his wife, the former Helen Griggs, and their six children; occasional attendance at a sports event and a myriad of public service activities—in addition to his continuing obligations to the government in particular and to science and education in general.

DECISION IN BRUSSELS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker. On February 23, 1971, an historic conference on Soviet Jewry opened in Brussels. A fine editorial with regard to this extraordinarily important world conference appeared in the Jewish Advocate on February 18, 1971.

The editorial reprinted below reflects the perceptiveness and excellence of the Jewish Advocate, a splendid weekly, published in Boston and read everywhere in the English speaking world.

[From the Jewish Advocate, Boston, Mass., Feb. 18, 1971]

DECISION IN BRUSSELS

Delegates from some 55 countries are already reported to be gathering for the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry in Brussels from February 23 to 25 to intensify efforts for their rights and liberties. It is expected to be one of the most powerful expressions of Jewish solidarity since the Second World War. The 500 delegates will hear an impressive list of speakers, including former Israel Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, Elie Wiesel, Arthur Goldberg, Saul Bellow, Chaim Gross, French Nobel Prize Winner Dr. Rene Cassin and Dr. Hans Morgenthau, among others.

World Jewry's deep concern for their coreligionists in the Soviet Union is shown by the declaration of the Brussels sponsors which includes a number of Jewish organi-

zations here and abroad. "The imprisonment of Jews in the USSR, the sentences handed down against Jews after (the Leningrad) closed-door trial," the declaration said, "makes more imperative than ever, international action to protect their basic rights and to assure that all Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel or elsewhere should be able to do so." It points out that "Soviet Jews are themselves in the van of the struggle for these rights, to their great peril." But, nevertheless, it notes, "the fundamental plight of Soviet Jews . . . is worsening as the Soviet authorities increase their anti-Jewish pressures."

Professor Boris Tsukerman, physicist and mathematician, "Zionist agitator" (in the eyes of the Soviet secret police) and star arrival among the recent newcomers to Israel from the USSR, has said that even if all the major "agitators" are allowed to leave the Soviet Union, as he was, or imprisoned, young Jews there will continue to protest. He stated the young are under increasing and tremendous pressures there and the struggle in their behalf must be kept up, not only because it bolsters Jewish morale inside the Soviet Union (they know, he affirms, of each individual demonstration on their behalf and are heartened by it), but because Moscow must not be let off the hook. Leonid Vladimirov-Finkelstein, the Russian-Jewish journalist who defected to England five years ago, assures that there is little prospect for spontaneous improvement for Soviet Jewry, not only because of the Kremlin's involvement with the Arab states but also because Jews still serve as a convenient scapegoat for economic difficulties and social unrest afflicting Soviet society.

Some Jewish leaders believe the Brussels meeting will fulfill the sponsors' declaration and Prof. Tsukerman's hopes and thereby have the same dramatic and finally practical impact on international Jewish life as the first Zionist Congress in Basle. Others, however, while lauding the Jewish solidarity expressed by the holding of such a convocation, are of the opinion that "not very much" will be accomplished. Which judgment of Brussels emerges rests with the delegates and their willingness and freedom to participate. From Boston alone, as indicated in a front-page story in this issue of the Advocate, a knowledgeable and spirited delegation will be attending. If elements of this group along with like-numbers from throughout the world are given the opportunity to propose and have adopted an action program for Soviet Jewry, that has both continuity and innovative aspects, the event can become historic. If the delegates generally find fulfillment in the conference itself, as has been too often the case in Jewish life, it will have failed not only those who participate but those whose lives may depend on its decisions. Success or failure: the assessment of Brussels will be made in Jewish flesh and blood.

AN UPPER MISSOURI BASIN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, since 1965, the Upper Missouri Basin States have been attempting to take advantage of title V of the Economic Development Act and obtain the establishment of an Upper Missouri Basin Economic Development Commission.

Members of Congress from the area

were participants in writing title V, authorizing such commissions, into the act in the first place, so we could obtain such a commission. The area has been patient for too long about the establishment of its commission. Five others have been established, but not for one area for which title V was designed.

Although Congress appropriated \$300,000 last year specifically for an Upper Missouri Basin Economic Development Commission, the administration has chosen to impound the funds.

Yesterday, it was my privilege to appear before the Economic Development Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, along with Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and the Governors of Wyoming, Montana, both Dakotas, and Nebraska, and recommending extension of the Economic Development Act, but this time with language that makes the Upper Missouri Basin Commission mandatory.

Following the hearing, the five Governors and the nine active Senators from the five States—Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota is recovering from illness—met and dispatched a joint letter to the White House insisting that the funds appropriated by Congress to launch the Commission be released and the Commission established.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to say that the House Members from the Missouri Basin did not join in the letter because there was not time to assemble them and get signatures.

I would like the record to show, however, that when the latest application for the Commission was filed, every Member of the House of both political parties, every Member of the Senate of both political parties, and every Governor of both political parties from the five States involved joined in the request for the Commission's establishment.

All of us from the Upper Missouri Basin in the House are stoutly behind the effort.

In my testimony before the Senate committee I pointed out that, if the policy is really to return power to the States—back from the Federal Government toward the people—then certainly the Federal Government should not veto this unanimous application of the Governors, Senators, and Congressmen elected by the people of the five States as their representatives.

To complete the record on this matter, I insert the text of the letter sent to the White House by the Governors and Senators, the testimony of Gov. Forrest Anderson before the Senate Economic Development Subcommittee, and my own testimony on that occasion:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1971.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Nearly a year ago, an application was submitted to create the Missouri River Regional Economic Development Commission under the authority of Public Law 89-136, Title V, as amended.

Correspondence to the Secretary of Commerce on June 17, 1970, conveyed our great interest and support for this Economic Development Commission proposed for the Up-

per Missouri. It was our feeling that the establishment of this Commission would be a major step toward finding a vehicle to aid in resolving some of the more difficult environmental and economic problems which are common to the Upper Missouri region.

Congress has appropriated \$300,000 to permit the Commission to become operative during this fiscal year. However, the application has not been approved and funds have not been released by the Office of Management and Budget even though a year has passed.

It is our considered opinion that the establishment of this Commission fits in the concept of revenue sharing being proposed by the Administration. If revenue sharing is enacted, this Commission would provide an administrative vehicle for advanced planning and a wise expenditure of such funds as may be made available on a regional basis.

Your assistance is respectfully requested in authorizing the Missouri River Regional Economic Development Commission and in the release of the necessary funds to permit it to get on with its work.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. Senator; LEE METCALF, U.S. Senator; GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senator; QUENTIN BURDICK, U.S. Senator; MILTON YOUNG, U.S. Senator; CARL CURTIS, U.S. Senator; ROMAN HRUSKA, U.S. Senator.

CLIFFORD HANSEN, U.S. Senator; GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator; Forrest Anderson, Governor of Montana; James Ekon, Governor of Nebraska; William Guy, Governor of North Dakota; Richard Kneip, Governor of South Dakota; Stanley Hathaway, Governor of Wyoming.

AN UPPER MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

(Statement by Governor Forrest H. Anderson, Mont., to the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works, February 24, 1971 in Washington, D.C.)

We are standing at the beginning of a new era on the northern plains. I believe the economic decline that has plagued this region of great farmlands in the recent past can be halted. We can begin to move forward again.

The agriculturally based economy of the plains states has suffered. Many farms have vanished, agricultural employment has decreased, per-capita income has fallen and good people have moved away.

In Montana alone, the number of persons employed in agriculture fell from fifty-four thousand in 1950, to thirty-three thousand at the end of 1968. This general decline has also caused economic problems in cities that support the agricultural population.

Montana has been static in an age of progress. We did not keep pace with the tremendous advances the national economy achieved in the last decade.

National per-capita income has increased 66 per cent since 1960. During the same period, per-capita income in Montana has risen only 53 percent. These are disturbing figures because they relate directly to the manner in which we live and raise our children.

The economic decline I have mentioned is not exclusive to Montana. The same problems exist in Cheyenne, Bismarck, Rapid City and all across the plains. The region has common problems, interests and resources. It has a mutual need to move forward with the rest of the nation. The Missouri River Economic Development Commission will be built on this foundation of commonality.

The Commission will emphasize the role of the states in a federal-state relationship.

The national government will work in cooperation with the five Commission states to analyze problems, inventory resources and develop plans to improve the quality of life in the region.

The Commission is needed to work to improve the economic and social conditions of the rural and urban areas within the region. Priorities have already been established—recreation and tourism, improved transportation facilities to effect lower freight rates, and increased trade. Human and natural resources will be better utilized. The economic base will be expanded to halt outmigration, raise median family income and provide additional job opportunities.

Achievement of these objectives will require much time and effort. There will not be immediate results, but programs such as the Commission offers are steps toward a better tomorrow. *We are confident these steps will become strides.*

The Missouri River is the timeless bond of the northern plains. It was the route of exploration and commerce that enabled young America to expand into the open lands of Nebraska, the Dakotas, Wyoming and Montana. The course of the river has been the course of history in this region.

Through the Commission, the Missouri River Basin States intend to begin a new history—a history of progress.

The states to be involved in this compact, as I have mentioned, have common problems, interests and resources. Regional solutions, through the Commission, rather than a proliferation of separate programs, will reduce costs and save tax money in each state.

A regional approach would be particularly effective in combatting air and water pollution. The Commission could establish effective and uniform emission control standards for the entire region. This would eliminate the possibility of an individual state reducing its pollution standards and threatening its environment to gain a competitive advantage in the search for new industries. Antipollution legislation would be enacted and enforced on a regional basis. Uniform laws would assure maintenance of the quality of our environment and promote balanced economic development.

A Regional Commission will be the best means of promoting judicious development. The Commission will have broad authority from initiating research on improved range management and livestock improvement, to financing all methods of transportation, industrial parks, housing grants, recreation facility loans, or any project which can be related to economic growth.

The primary problem in agricultural areas throughout the region is a lack of facilities to process the abundance produced on our farms and ranches. Most of the livestock, grains and other products of our ranches and farms are shipped directly east for processing. The only return we receive is higher consumer prices and marginal farm prices.

A priority of the Commission will be to attempt to develop processing facilities in the region to establish vertical integration of the agricultural economy. This would benefit the man who raises the product and the man who buys it in the market by reducing excessive transportation costs.

The Commission is not a pipe dream nor an empty scheme hidden behind a pompous title.

This idea has been tested under the most difficult circumstances, and it works.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has achieved substantial social and economic improvements in that area of extreme social disintegration and hardcore poverty. And there are 5 other regional commissions presently in operation.

If the application for the establishment of the Commission is approved—and the states

work together in a common effort—we will begin to realize the enormous potential of the northern plains region and its people.

This will not be easy, but in all of the states of the Missouri River Basin there are those that believe the Commission will achieve the progress we need.

A regional commission will not conflict with revenue sharing proposals presently being considered by Congress and the Administration.

The Commission will be an administrative apparatus.

It will be an inter-state compact to develop cooperation, better utilization of resources and common solutions to the social, economic and environmental problems of the northern plains region.

It will actually enhance the effect of any finally enacted revenue sharing program by establishing the administrative capability to apply regional solutions to regional problems.

Let me assure you that this Commission is necessary.

I have outlined the serious collection of problems afflicting the northern plains states. Nothing has been done for too long.

And I believe it is time we counter the economic decline of recent years and begin to move toward a better tomorrow.

A REGIONAL APPROACH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS NEEDED IN THE UPPER MISSOURI BASIN

(Statement of Congressman JOHN MELCHER, of Montana, before the Senate Public Works Committee, February 24, 1971)

Mr. Chairman, a regional approach to economic development is essential in areas of relatively sparse population, capital, and public revenues. In such areas, it takes the combined strength and numbers of the people of a river basin, or a geographic region with common problems, to provide the capital and other essentials for growth which a single state, or small political subdivision, does not have standing alone.

Energy is an excellent example. Low cost energy is essential to industrial development. Small electric generating units are uneconomical. Only when an area with consumers sufficient to justify generating plants of at least 100,000 kw capacity—and a million is better—has been linked into a single transmission grid can the economies of size be achieved which are necessary to be competitive in the field of electric energy supply.

The Upper Missouri Basin was one of this Nation's highest cost electrical energy areas until development of the main stem of the river required the development of a transmission grid to market the power. That grid now serves eight states and has now made possible the construction of generating units, to meet load growth, in multiples of 100,000 kilowatts.

We are increasingly confronted with the need for size—an adequate service or supporting area—to justify specialized educational programs, a medical college, for example; or adequately broad research programs, in plains grazing lands management as an example in that field; or on transportation problems, animal health, livestock breeding—many problems which one farmer or rancher, or even one state, cannot support alone.

In the Upper Missouri Basin we have common minerals development problems which need joint attention. I believe we are on the threshold of a breakthrough in use of giant beds of low-sulphur coal found in both of the Dakotas, Eastern Montana, and Wyoming. Our coal is now moving east to generate power for the Twin Cities and Chicago in competition with oil, gas, and atoms. With the perfection of magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), which is a process for generating

electricity directly from coal, which doubles its efficiency and provides nearly pollution-free generation, our area can become the powerhouse, or power source, of the northwestern quarter of the United States. But we need a united regional effort to speed the development of this process—and the Tennessee Valley Authority developed high concentrate fertilizers to the benefit not only of its area but of the whole nation.

And we will need a regional approach to regulatory problems in this same respect—common requirements for strip-mined land restoration if we are to avoid competition for coal resource development in terms of lax and inadequate strip-mined land restoration requirements.

We have a great opportunity to develop recreation—leisure industries—in the Upper Great Plains area. On the West are Glacier National Park, Yellowstone and the Grand Tetons. A plan for a vast recreational complex including the Great Lakes of the Missouri River—the reservoirs behind the great mainstream dams,—a Lewis and Clark Trail tourway, a prairie wildlife refuge, Indian reservations, and historic sites, has already been blueprinted for us. A prairie tourway through the center of the regional commission's area, and a parkway linking our Western mountain parks from Glacier to the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, have all been proposed but still lay on the drawing boards for want of an agency, or a vehicle, which will unite the efforts of the states to bring about their completion and the expansion of tourist, or leisure industries, which our area and the citizens of the nation, now being crowded into overflowing parks and campgrounds and other recreational facilities, very greatly need.

There is not time to dwell at length on our need for the development of industry—general industry, our agricultural industry, mining, and the so-called leisure industries; our need for specialized educational facilities and research; and our need for the development of common policies in many fields, illustrated by the strip mining problem I have mentioned.

Our common problems are numerous, and so are our common opportunities. All of the Governors of the five States, all of the Senators of the five States, and all of the Congressmen from the five States—men of both political parties—have joined in petitioning for an Upper Missouri Basin Regional Economic Development Commission.

If the desire is to "return power to the people," to let the States and governmental units below the federal level make more of the decision, as President Nixon stated to the nation last month, then it is difficult to comprehend why funds for this regional commission have been impounded. The elected spokesmen for these states and the congressional districts within them are unanimously supporting a commission.

They say "Yes," unanimously.

The President's policy says "yes."

But the Office of Management and Budget, which is increasingly becoming the real federal voice, says "No."

I urge this Committee, Mr. Chairman, to renew Title V of the Economic Development Act and to write the word "shall" into it, to be applicable at least in all those areas which meet the qualifications for an economic development commission and in which all the Governors of both parties, all the Senators of both parties, and all the Congressmen of both parties, have cast their votes for its establishment.

We can use a little revenue sharing now, and we prefer not to wait the obviously extended period it is going to require to get agreement on revenue sharing, get it approved, and get it operative.

EMPIRE STATE IS EXPECTING MILITARY VOTE TO DOUBLE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the annual report for 1970 of the New York State Division for Servicemen's Voting which spells out the efforts to provide voting opportunities to our men in service as well as the response received at the ballot box.

This report is of particular interest to me, because of my continuing concern that men in service be assured of their voting rights. Further, the report spells out the manner in which the State of New York has proceeded to attempt to reach and convince every serviceman of the need for exercising his voting rights.

It is interesting to note that the State agency is predicting a doubling of the military vote as a result of the lowering of the voting age from 21 to 18.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including with my remarks the text of the report as prepared by Elmer E. Lux, chairman, and Walter E. Cooke, secretary, who are the directors of the division:

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1970

Military information indicates that approximately one hundred forty-nine thousand (149,000) men and women from New York State are serving in the Military Service throughout the world.

The Division for Servicemen's Voting is responsible for the continuing administration of the original and amended laws of Chapter #852 of 1942 (Chapter #31 of 1970)—Ballots for Military Personnel.

The Law guarantees to every eligible voter of this State in the active military service of the State or of the United States, in the army, navy, air force, service academies, or any branch thereof, or in the coast guard, and the spouse, parent and child of such voter accompanying or being with him or her, if a qualified voter and a resident of the same election district, the right to cast a ballot for every office, federal, state and local, and for every amendment, referendum, proposition and question to be voted upon at every general election and every special election.

Thirty-two thousand two hundred fifty-one (32,251) eligible military voters were provided ballots for the November 3, 1970 Elections in New York State. Eighty-three thousand (83,000) 1970 ballot applications and detailed instructions were forwarded to those who voted in the years 1968 and 1969—for the November 3, 1970 Elections.

APPLICATION MADE AVAILABLE

In addition to these mailings, ballot application forms were available at all military installations, induction and reception centers and other service organizations throughout the world, such as USO, Red Cross, Catholic, Jewish, YMCA and YWCA Service Units, and the Travelers Aid. All of these units have been generously cooperative in alerting military personnel to the availability of these applications.

The Press, Radio and TV media again extended the use of their space, time and effort through the publication and presentation of Press releases and spot announcements, in-

forming the servicemen and their families of the availability of these ballot applications and their opportunity to protect the servicemen's great American privilege to vote. Many newspapers printed facsimiles of the ballot application, which were accepted as a valid request when properly filled in and signed.

The offices of Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Comptroller, Supreme Court Justices, U.S. Senate, Congress, State Senate and Assembly in addition to many important county, city, town and other local offices were on the Ballot this year.

There were four Special Elections in New York State during 1970. (Borough) Bronx—84th Assembly District, (Borough) Queens—25th Assembly District, (County) Wayne—County Refuse District, County Herkimer—Charter Amendment for City of Little Falls.

STATE POLICE DELIVER BALLOTS

Special thanks again to the Superintendent of State Police William E. Kirwin and his efficient associates under the direction of Sergeant James Tedesco, who delivered the ballots to all the boards of elections throughout the State of New York. We are profoundly grateful for the efficient, courteous and indispensable service they perform each year during this important period.

During 1970 periodic conferences were held with the Election Commissioners and the Joint Legislative Committee, to review and revise various provisions of the law. These exchanges of information and the conference participation at the annual meetings of the election commissioners have been most helpful in our continuing efforts to improve and make more efficient the administration of the election laws as they relate to military personnel.

The usual tentative political calendar has been delayed pending a determination of the 1971 Primary Date by the Legislature. We are hopeful that a decision will be made before the Election Commissioners Conference scheduled for February 23, 1971.

MILITARY VOTE MAY DOUBLE

The reduction in the voting age from twenty-one (21) to eighteen (18) will, unquestionably double the military vote, as this group represents the largest age bracket inducted in the Armed Forces annually. We have revised all Ballot Application Forms etc. to meet the age requirements and administrative changes necessary. We are making studies as to the impact this will have on our staff requirements beginning with the 1972 elections; or any special federal elections before 1972.

We again received many letters anent the military voter's interest and concern with receiving their ballots in time to vote in the general and special elections. Most of these letters are complimentary but some are sharply critical in such instances where a Board of Elections has failed to promptly print and mail the Military Ballots as provided by law, that Military Ballots must never be delayed for any reason, including court challenges to a nomination or certification.

It is interesting to also note in the many communications we are currently receiving—the thought already being given by many servicemen and women, to the change in the law granting the Right to Vote—to all citizens beginning with their eighteenth birthday.

Servicemen have become increasingly aware of the fact that their vote, while they are away from home, is equally as important—if not more so because of the closeness of so many elections in the last few years.

We are grateful to the Secretary of State—Judge John P. Lomenzo and his staff, Assemblyman Peter Blondo and his Joint Legisla-

tive Committee and to the Boards of Elections for their cooperative dedication to do the kind of job that the Military Voters expect of us.

HATS OFF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding privileges we enjoy as Members of this great body is that of appointing outstanding young men to our Nation's military service academies. I have been personally pleased each time a boy decides to become a candidate for this honor and I know many of my colleagues in the House share this feeling of pride and satisfaction. It is equally rewarding to keep track of the progress made by candidates appointed in the past. Because the education afforded to these young men is among the finest available in our Nation, the standards are rigorous and demanding. It is, therefore, especially satisfying to me to learn of appointees who attain high honors in their respective academies.

In a recent editorial, the Cocke County Banner in Eastern Tennessee expressed very well some of the feelings which I have on this subject and complimented my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, on the valuable assistance which he has given to young men seeking an education and a career in our Nation's military services. As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, it is my wish to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to join the Banner in commending those mentioned in its text:

HATS OFF

This newspaper was pleased to learn of Congressman James H. Quillen's principal nomination of Iliff R. McMahan, Jr., for appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York. Cadet candidate McMahan is now stationed at the United States Military Academy Preparatory School at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and if memory serves us right, he is the second young man from Cooke County to attend that school. After we study the curriculum of the preparatory school and knowing generally the military needs of our country, we realize and take comfort in the knowing that the United States Military Academy Preparatory School has eagerly prepared thousands of young men to meet the needs of our country to insure our national security.

The BANNER commends the U.S. Army, the United States Military Academy Preparatory School, Lt. Col. Walter S. Cousland, Commandant, the commissioned and non-commissioned officers and the instructors at this institution who we feel should be given credit for devoting so much of their time and energies to training the thousands of young men to become our future military leaders.

Like today's military leaders, the graduates of the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School will serve to stand between this country and those subversive forces which seek to destroy it. In these critical times when the "In" thing to do is to criticize the military, it

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

behooves all Americans to stop, think and be grateful for those who, despite severe criticism, possess the courage and patriotism to select and train our military leaders of tomorrow. For exercising this excellent foresight, we say "Hats Off" to the U.S. Army and to all others whose duty it is to see the continued success of the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School.

And we feel special recognition is due Lt. Col. Cousland, on whose shoulders fall the success or failure of this great preparatory school, and Congressman Quillen who makes it possible for a number of young East Tennesseans to be afforded the opportunity to attend West Point and the other military academies. We proudly salute those we have mentioned because we feel they care and have the courage to exercise their options to keep the United States of America the light of the Free World.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO A FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 12th of this month Americans of Polish descent commemorated the birth date of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a true lover of freedom, a true architect of American independence, a true volunteer soldier who left the comforts of his native land to fight in the most noble cause—for American independence.

Called by Thomas Jefferson "the purest spirit of liberty," Kosciuszko was born on February 12, 1746, at Siechnowicz, Poland. As a youth his brilliance and particularly his aptitude for engineering were so outstanding that they came to the attention of the King of Poland, who sent him to France to study at the leading French military schools.

In France he studied the art of soldiering under Lafayette and preceded his teacher to America, arriving in August 1776, when he was immediately commissioned as colonel of engineering in the Continental Army.

He masterfully built fortifications at West Point and his brilliant choice of battlefields and erection of fortifications at Saratoga are said by many to have been a major factor in turning the tide of battle in favor of the Americans.

He fought at Ticonderoga and later was a leader of the American troops in South Carolina.

It was while he was fortifying West Point that he recommended this spot be considered as a future site for a military academy. It was his recommendation that led to the selection of West Point for our U.S. Military Academy which was established on March 16, 1802, with a first class, numbering 10 cadets, entering on July 4, 1802. West Point has been a military post since January 20, 1778.

Kosciuszko not only contributed great skill as an engineer and tactician but he endeared himself to his troops and fellow officers for his valiant and courageous leadership on the fields of battle.

He could well have chosen to remain

February 26, 1971

in America and enjoy the love and acclaim of the American people while making continued contributions to our Armed Forces of which he was now a full fledged general.

However, Kosciuszko chose to return to Europe and to his native Poland where he issued a call to arms. Polish patriots rushed to his side to begin a telling battle for Polish independence. Unfortunately, the military might of Catherine the Great was so enormous, the efforts of Kosciuszko and his followers were in vain. The gallant leader was captured at the Battle of Maciejowice and imprisoned in a dungeon. Only after the death of Catherine was he liberated—sorely ill and suffering physically, but still having a burning passion for freedom.

Because of his valor and because of his accomplishments, a grateful Congress bestowed upon him all the rights and privileges of American citizenship along with a grant of 500 acres of land and \$12,000 in cash.

Before his final departure from American soil, Kosciuszko left a document with his friend, Thomas Jefferson. It was his last will and testament, dated May 5, 1798, directing that his American property be used to purchase freedom for Negro slaves and to provide for their education.

It is Thaddeus Kosciuszko's complete and unselfish dedication to the principles of human rights and freedom for all peoples that I particularly ask the House to recall today. In testimony to this dedication, I wish to include the text of the will which he left with his dear friend Thomas Jefferson:

I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other giving them liberty in my name; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, in their duty as citizens; teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this will, there was a school built in the 1820's at Parisippa, N.J. which educated "men of colour" to teach religion and science in Liberia and Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at that point of my remarks excerpts from "The African Repository and Colonial Journal," volumes 1 and 2, 1825-26, which led to the establishment of the Kosciuszko School, fulfilling the intent of Kosciuszko's last will and testament:

[From the African Repository, vol. 1,
1825-26]

AFRICAN SCHOOL

The Board of Directors of the African School at Parisippa, N. Jersey, have made a report to the Synods of New-York and New-Jersey, recommending an important change in the plan of that Institution. They state, that efforts to obtain funds for the school in its present state, have been vain; that the insensibility to the worth of virtuous and

enlightened character, among the people of colour, renders it necessary that education, to be of high benefit, should be commenced early in life, and that the exigency of the times demands an Institution more enlarged and better endowed, to prepare coloured men for civil offices in Liberia and Hayti, and to fit them to instruct others in science and religion:

"The board take the liberty of urging the following, among many considerations, that bear, as they conceive, with peculiar force upon the Synods of New York and New Jersey, in view of the proposed improvement of the plan for the education of our African population.

"The States in which the Synods are located have done much in legislation to emancipate their slaves. A few years will consummate the hope of philanthropy as to one grand step in her progress, and leave not a soul in bondage within our borders. But this will be only a preliminary step; for, while the reproach of the name is taken away, the debasing and corrupting influence of slavery will remain to degrade this long afflicted people. Indeed, from the results of the manumission system, we are almost led to believe that to extend mere freedom to the slave, is like the tender mercies of the wicked. You set him loose upon society to act for himself, with no qualifications but a freedom paper; when to all the practical purposes of useful life he needs a guardianship more than infancy; and if his ignorance does not perpetuate his degeneracy, the deep rooted prejudice of the whites, that separates him from all communion in social and civil intercourse, will fix him in hopeless despondency. And shall we then, after our civil rulers have yielded to the desires of humanity and broken off the shackles from the body—shall we without another struggle leave the benighted soul in darkness and the shadow of death?

"Experience has demonstrated that no system of amelioration for them can possess any energy unless it be exclusive. They are emphatically a separate people! They must be trained and educated by themselves; and it is the dictate of the soundest wisdom to deal with them as they are. Let them so understand us—that we are instructing them not for our society—not to form our magistrates or legislators; but preparing them to go home."

"The Committee to whom the consideration of this report was referred, introduced the following resolution, which was passed unanimously:

"Resolved, That the African School be continued—and that the Board of Directors be instructed to digest a more extensive plan of operations for the school, and report thereon at the next stated meeting—And that in doing this they be at liberty to correspond with the Board of Managers of the New-Jersey Colonization Society, or such individuals as may feel interested in the welfare of the Africans, as to the Board may seem expedient."

In consequence of this Report, the Synod of New-York passed several similar Resolutions, of which we insert the following:

"Resolved, That the Board of Directors, to be appointed by the Synods, be authorized to open a correspondence with such individuals and bodies of men, and to adopt such other measures as to them may be thought expedient, with a view to the more extended and efficient instruction of the African race; and that in this enterprise, they have the hearty approbation of this Synod."

"The Directors chosen on the part of the Synod of New-York are, Rev. Robert McCarter, Elithu W. Baldwin, Loring D. Dewey, Mr. Thomas Masters, Dr. Thomas Weed, Mr. John R. Murray."

This school is one of those objects, which we think has an urgent claim for aid upon

all the charitable and Religious. The resurrection of a race long morally and intellectually dead to the light of knowledge, hope and virtue, is not a matter to be despised by a generous soul. From the darkest shades of its present existence, a voice is heard, the tone of which is thrilling to every feeling heart. "Watchman, what of the night?" and is there none of those who have themselves been cheered by the day spring from on high, to answer—"The morning cometh." Affluence may make itself richer by its donations to such a purpose, laying up durable wealth, in the kingdom of Heaven, and securing an interest, which will accumulate in funds not to be corroded, and never to perish. We have reason to hope, that the bequest made by Gen. Kusiuko for the redemption and education of African Slaves, may be in some way applied for the enlargement and support of this school, and perhaps the name of this noble friend to a people whose friends have been few, shall be associated with an institution for their benefit, durable as the liberties or mountains of our country, and bright as the discoveries of Bacon.

[From the African Repository, vol. 2, 1826-27]

SOCIETY FOR THE EDUCATION OF AFRICAN YOUTH

On the third Monday in April last, a meeting of the friends to African education was held in Newark, New Jersey, where a very respectable number both of the clergy and laity of the state, expressed a deep interest in the object for which they were convened. An association was organized, (the name of which is at the head of this notice,) a constitution adopted, and seven trustees elected for the management of its concerns. The trustees will meet again on the 1st Monday in August, to adopt further measures for the accomplishment of their design. We indulge great hopes that the Kusiuko fund, may be applied in some way, to advance the noble purposes of this Institution, and should this be the case, no doubt is entertained, that the public charities will soon establish it on a broad and durable foundation. A few liberal donations from the opulent of our country, added to the generous bequest of Gen. Kusiuko, would build up a seminary of immense utility to Africa and the world. May a plan so well commenced, not fail of a completion.

[From the African Repository, vol. 2, 1826-27]

KUSIUSKO SCHOOL

A committee of the African Education Society in New Jersey, have addressed a circular letter to the public explaining the origin of their institution and its object, and soliciting funds in aid of the same. The preparation of free coloured children and youth for usefulness in Africa, is a prominent purpose which the trustees of this school will aim to accomplish, and we hope on this account, if on no other, it will receive general countenance and a liberal support. The committee state, that the Kusiuko Fund originally left by an illustrious foreigner in the hands of Mr. Jefferson, to be employed in liberating and educating African slaves, and which was confided by the lamented executor to Benjamin L. Lear, Esq. of this city, will be appropriated for the benefit of their school, and they express the hope that the "collected fruits of benevolence from the whole American people, will not prove less than the free will offering of a single Poland, to the captives of Ethiopia enslaved in our land." The available amount of the fund left by gen. Kusiuko, is at this time about thirteen thousand dollars, and the trustees wish to raise from public charity an equal sum. The contribution of eight dollars is necessary to constitute a subscriber a member of the Society. "The board of

trustees intend to rent a small farm—and to connect the literary pursuits of the school with agricultural and mechanical employments. They hope to secure the services of a pious practical farmer, a mechanic of like character, and at least one judicious well qualified preceptor of the school and superintendent of the whole establishment. Donations for this institution should be remitted to Joseph C. Hornblower, Esq. Newark, New Jersey, secretary and treasurer of the Board.

Polish Americans are justly proud of the memory of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, whose name is treasured as a shining example of the Polish contribution to American life; but all Americans, and all men, owe honor to the memory of one whose life was dedicated, with entire unselfishness and with unswerving courage, to the cause of liberty—the hero of Poland and of America, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

MORAL DECLARATION ON DRUGS BY PARKVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the seniors at Baltimore County's Parkville High School in my district have declared war on hard drugs. A delegation elected by Mr. Ralph Jaffe's social studies classes visited my office recently to urge a congressional moral declaration of war against the use of hard drugs. The students accompanying Mr. Jaffe were Michael Gaffee, William Herd, Stephen Lee, Robert Martino, and John J. Scott.

The 1970 Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act and earlier laws establishing stiff penalties for drug abuse and creating drug education programs imply that we are waging a moral war on drugs.

I should like to commend the students for their interest in the legislative process and for their willingness to work within the system instead of against it. At this point I should like to share their views with my colleagues:

STUDENTS ASK FOR DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST HARD DRUGS

In accordance with article I Section 8, a group of students from Parkville Senior High should like the Congress to pass a moral declaration of war against the usage of hard drugs by the people of our nation. We are taking this stand because we believe this is a step in the right direction, to demonstrate our concern of drug addiction and to demonstrate to our nation that not all students believe that hard drugs are the answer to our problems. We believe further research is needed to determine whether or not marijuana or other soft drugs should be legalized, but we do have very strong feelings about our opposition to the following hard drugs: Opium derivatives, Cocaine, Coca Leaves, Dihydrocodinone, Dihydromorphinone, Laudinum, Mespertidine, Isonipealine, Methadone, Pantopon, Paragoric, NU 2206 (3-Hydroxy-N-Methyl-Morphinan).

We also believe this declaration of war by Congress should encourage its members to develop a further extensive program, whereby trained ex-addicts can have more

opportunities to go into the elementary and junior high schools to relate and not to preach about their experiences and problems with drug addiction in the hopes of giving students a better understanding of drug addiction.

We also believe that the citizens of the United States should know what countries are illegally exporting drug traffic to the United States, so that all citizens can determine for themselves whether or not a boycott of those nations' products would help to stop the illegal drug traffic.

CLEVELAND URBAN LEAGUE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the Cleveland Urban League recently held its 53d annual meeting. During those 53 years, its members have worked with tireless dedication to achieve and insure equality for all Americans.

Several indications of the league's activity were included in the January 1971 issue of its newspaper, the *New Thrust*. One article summarized the urban league's important but unknown efforts in assisting the Census Bureau to make an accurate count of Cleveland's black community. Two other articles recapped the comments of two men who have made significant contributions to their city and their organization. Ernest C. Cooper, executive director, commented on "1970 in Retrospect" and President Julian Madison, addressed himself to "The Challenge of 1971."

Mr. Speaker, in this new year and new Congress, it is my view that my colleagues can benefit from learning something of the Cleveland Urban League's achievements. The articles follow:

1970 IN RETROSPECT

(By Ernest Cooper)

The year 1970 has been a demanding one for the Urban League. The Urban League has entered 1971 with the greatest tenacity.

A lack of adequate funds from the Welfare Federation;

gross unemployment;
the inability to get construction unions to meet with equal and fair employment practices;

the continuing refusal of major groups to comply with existing federal statutes;

failure of the Federal government to strongly enforce Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) laws;

the adamant resistance of local employers to the city equal employment ordinance;

the lack of high priority in the local community to the problems and needs of the poor;

the disadvantaged and the elderly;
the quest of the black and other minorities to exercise power thwarted at every hand;

the demise of a Federal manpower program designed to provide a secure economic base for the unemployed and underemployed, coupled with the death of the proposed Family Assistance Plan at the hands of Congress.

If this sounds depressing; if this creates a sense of disillusionment, if this smacks of

disappointment and despair, then this adequately describes 1970.

Against this backdrop and in response to these demands, the Urban League is obligated to provide constructive channels and alternatives for the black and other minority communities to realize some of their hopes and aspirations. We have continued to expand and resolve employment opportunities for minority citizens through our work with employers in the community. We have formed coalition with other involved groups to work on problems in the construction industry and in education. We launched the Street Academy Program, a pilot demonstration program to assist dropouts continuing and completing their education. We are working with veterans, especially Viet Nam veterans, to assist them in their readjustment to civilian life. We have provided information to citizens and groups to help them more fully participate in the civic life of our city. We have challenged the housing system to make its services and the housing supply truly open to all in accordance with the law. We have cooperated with and called upon agencies of government to carry out their responsibility to insure equal employment for all.

These demands are still with us and must be attacked with increased effort in 1971. In order for us to do our job, we must have increased support from the community.

1. Economic well being of minority families: depends on the expanded and improved employment training opportunities up and down the job ladder. Increased opportunities for minority groups—people to participate in the economic life of the community as businessmen entrepreneurs and employers.

2. Education: This is potentially one of the explosive problems facing us today. For our present education system is not serving effectively many people. The system must be changed so that we cease to produce people who are not prepared to compete in our rapidly changing society. We must have greater citizen involvement in the direction and quality education provided our youth. More alternatives must be provided for the educational fulfillment of people.

3. Housing: Too many of our citizens are ill-housed and with no prospect for improvement in their houses because of current practices and attitudes in the housing market. The inadequate manner in which we have responded to the housing needs of low or moderate income citizens is a horrible indictment against our housing system. We must insure that all people have true access of the total housing supply of our community, based on their limited financial ability and desire. We must have true compliance and implementation to fair housing laws. In addition, new methods of providing adequate amounts and quality of housing for low middle income families must be found.

4. Citizen participation: For too long blacks and other minority group citizens have felt alienated from the mainstream of American society—lacking the opportunity to participate in all phases of community life and at all levels of human endeavor. This must be changed so that we can make use of the abilities and concerns of all citizens in our city.

These are the problems that will occupy the attention of the Urban League during 1971 and the years ahead. These are obtainable goals, but we need your help. Because of the attitudes of people, the economic state in our society, and the distorted priority system in our community, than private voluntary agencies including the Urban League, working in an human services field, have been severely pinched financially. If we are to do the job we must, then we will need increased support from the community, from both organization sources as well as individuals.

We earnestly appeal to you for your partici-

pation and support of the Urban League and its program to make them more effective and relevant to today's needs. Will you join with us in making our community a healthier and happier place for all of our citizens to live in?

THE CHALLENGE OF 1971

(By Julian C. Madison)

1970 was not a good year for those of us with long service in the fight for freedom, nor for the millions of Americans, black and white, who know poverty in a land of plenty.

For Julian Madison, as president of the Urban League of Cleveland, 1970 was a year of mixed rewards and frustrations.

And even then, the rewards were deceptive . . . a tortuous tokenism that saw a limited number of new jobs opened to the talented black tenth so long denied employment commensurate to their skills and education; a trickle of black entrepreneurship; a major surge in the election of non-whites to public office in the deep South; the movement of a few black upper middleclass families to suburbia, that were glamorized in the press, but minuscule in their effect on the total problems posed by black poverty and black powerlessness.

The frustrations however, were quite familiar . . . spreading slums, the outgrowth of urban redevelopment planning that resulted in "Negro removal" rather than adequate housing for low-income families; black children continuing to be crippled by irrelevant, de-facto segregated public schools; tightened barriers against the acquisition of skilled trades, and the ever-dormant white racism that pervades our society curdling into a bitter backlash against further black progress.

It has been my good fortune to have been given a penetrating look into these contradictions as president of the Urban League of Cleveland, and to be inspired to contribute to their solutions by the Urban League's national director, Whitney M. Young, the dynamic young man who has challenged all League affiliates to engineer a "New Thrust" to the League's traditional approaches to the long-standing problems posed for non-whites in a majority white society.

My most gratifying experience in 1970 is to have witnessed, and to have played a part in, the development of this new and resolute stance that has been adopted by the staff of the Urban League of Cleveland in dedicating themselves to a dynamic program that has, for now and in the foreseeable future, abandoned forever its former image of subservience to gradualism in its quest for equal citizenship and equal opportunity for those who look to the Urban League for leadership.

Historically noted for its penchant for peace—at almost any price Urban League, the nation over, can no longer—will no longer—settle for the snail-like pace of progress our society has ordered in its timetable for black equality, black pride, and black dignity.

Peace, under such conditions, to men of spirit, has become obnoxious!

Thus, we of the Urban League, allied with those white citizens of goodwill who with us have served their apprenticeship in the gloom of the ghetto, on the pock-marked pallsades of poverty, in the stench and stagnation of the slums, and in the frightening forest of frustration, are determined in 1971 to march together as full journeymen in the fight for freedom in our time, not content to wait for the ever elusive tomorrow.

In 1971, we are determined not only to assert a new thrust, but also to launch a bold and effective attack against those still-unyielding forces in our society that stand adamantly in the path leading to:

Equal justice under the law.

Equal opportunity to live in a decent neighborhood.

Equal opportunity to have our children

receive quality education in the public schools.

Equal opportunity to become employers instead of employees.

Equal opportunity to direct community planning.

Equal opportunity to govern as well as be governed.

In our resolution, we are not unmindful, nor ungrateful, for the gains produced during the turbulent 60s, gains growing out of the climate set by national leaders with the courage to demand reform, not because it was politically expedient but because it was right. Further, we here pay special tribute to those Cleveland corporations, large and small, that have given more than lip service to the slogan "Equal Opportunity Employer."

But we are not lulled into either complacency or false hopes by what, in the sum total of the struggle, amounts to paltry tokenism.

Nor are we unaware of the forces of racism and bigotry that have been set into motion by these paltry advancements. With every forward step we have taken to better our condition, there are those who have responded with equal and opposite reaction.

It is a reaction, growing with alarming intensity . . . that leaps boldly from the front pages of our powerful newspapers, day after day:

That assails our eardrums from billions of radio sets.

That sneaks into our living rooms from electronic picture tubes, while program sponsors "integrate" their commercials in order to win our dollars.

That rises from the floor of Cleveland City Council, from the state house in Columbus, and from the Halls of Congress.

That is beginning to emerge from the United States Supreme Court that has been deliberately diluted of its liberalism in a calculated attempt to restore the status-quo in constitution interpretation that once opted for "separate but equal schools."

And of late, we hear of emerging from Christian pulpits from which pious prelates preach from their personal "Book of Bigotry" a text that says "keep them out."

We can sense the effectiveness of this racism in the flight of our one-zealous "liberal" friends from the fight, and in the half-measures offered us as 'conscience money' by those who publicly prate of peace and brotherhood and of law and order.

We can sense it in the acts of those who occupy the seats of power who continue to prescribe laxities for a social system badly in need of a purgative; whose community involvement investments are calculated to produce peace rather than black progress . . . quiet instead of quality.

Through the years these are the forces that have looked to the Urban League to provide the "bridge of communication" between themselves and the damned, and to maintain the role of peacekeeper and talent scout to attract that black talented tenth desired as tokens of their tolerance.

Meanwhile the neighborhoods surrounding Urban League offices stir with discord, discontent, futility and frustration.

We observe United Appeal funds lavished on recreation, cultural centers instead of relevant programs that will equip disadvantaged non-whites to enter the mainstream of our society.

The Urban League of Cleveland, during the past year, has assembled a staff of dedicated professionals and involved trustees and volunteers that, we feel, ideally equips us to deal with compassionate, knowledgeable efficiency many city, state and federal programs that thus far have been entrusted either to luke-warm bureaucrats or to calculating opportunists.

It is no secret that in 1971 we shall make strong arguments, beginning with the President of the United States, to be given administrative supervision of some of these

programs, and to structure others of greater relevance.

Meanwhile, the Urban League of Cleveland—in 1971—is challenged to direct its skills, its resources, however meager, and its talents, from accommodation to aggression. We are challenged to direct our priorities.

From the talented tenth to the underprivileged 90th.

From hard-core incurables to the working poor.

From an artificially forced culture to a black heritage.

From the recruitment of the unskilled to the development and utilization of the black skill potential.

From the soap box to the ballot box.

In this task, armed with the tools we have sharpened in our adversity, impressed with the urgency of our mission, and sustained by the conviction that self-help is the principal ingredient of self-respect, we solicit the support and prayers of all men of goodwill in our community, confident that our cause is just as well as in the best interest to the nation to which our loyalty and devotion is a matter of indelible record.

"OPERATION FULL COUNT" IN CENSUS SURVEILLANCE

More than two million Black Americans were missed by the 1960 census takers, comprising about 10 percent of the black community in the United States.

The Urban League of Cleveland decided to monitor the census bureau project in the Greater Cleveland community, and became one of ten cities in the United States to launch "Operation Full Count."

The United States Census Bureau admitted that such an error did occur, and blamed the attitudes of residents of the major urban ghettos, and fear on the part of white census takers for the undercount.

Such a mistake was costly for black people. Had the count been accurate, there might have been as many as five more black representatives elected to Congress and 19 additional state legislators.

The incorrect count also cost black communities throughout the United States federal funds that are usually allocated in accordance with census figures.

To insure the most nearly accurate count, the Urban League of Cleveland hired well known radio personality John B. Slade, and launched an onslaught of publicity and media communications seldom seen except in paid advertisement.

Slade, who was appointed project director, joined the project after seventeen years at Radio Station WJMO.

Every attempt was made to assist the Census Bureau in cooperation with more than two hundred community groups, to impress on people the importance of filling out and returning their census questionnaires. Further, the League helped recruit census takers, enumerators, clerks and other categories of workers for the bureau—along with a major community education program.

More than 100,000 pieces of educational material was prepared by the local office and every radio and television station in the city ran copy submitted by Slade and assisted this project.

For a six month period, the duration of the census project, the Urban League exhorted the black community to be sure and return the questionnaire, so that Cleveland would be eligible for federal programs, based on population.

Many, many residents complained about the highly sophisticated forms that were obviously arranged to frustrate the ordinary citizen. Many others complained that too many questions were asked that invaded the privacy of the individual. Many citizens called the League to say that census takers never showed at their address. The project director noted that whole sections of apart-

ment houses on the East side of Cleveland had not been contacted, either through mail or by visit.

A temporary report that Cleveland had lost many thousands of Black American citizens brought the Urban League to a hearing from the Congressional Committee, headed by George Gould, field representative.

Mrs. Anita Polk, Deputy Director of the Urban League, arranged an appointment with the committee and Arnold L. Pinkney at Cleveland City Hall, at their (Committee's) request and made many of the observations as to the League's accountability in the "Operation Full Count." Of the ten cities, the National Urban League praised the totality of the Cleveland League effort, unsurpassed in record keeping and in-depth understanding for what was a most difficult task.

PHILADELPHIA'S REHABILITATION AID PROGRAM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia homeowners received 647 Federal grants and loans for home improvements in 1970, amounting to \$3,408,411, it was announced today by Francis J. Myers, Jr., director of the redevelopment authority. This is an increase over the 1969 totals of 537 grants and loans and \$3,093,374.

The 5-year total since the rehabilitation aid program began is 2,643 grants and loans amounting to \$11,049,848. Philadelphia has utilized this means of assisting families to rehabilitate their houses more than any other city in the country, Myers said.

These figures are in addition to a similar program by the city's department of licenses and inspections in special code enforcement and neighborhood renewal program areas. The loans and grants pay for improvements such as new roofs, porches, bathrooms, kitchens, wall and floor repairs, and installation of modern electrical, heating, and plumbing systems.

The grants, up to \$3,500, are made to low-income families and do not have to be repaid. The loans, issued at 3 percent interest, are for improvements to single-family homes in amounts up to \$14,600, and may be repaid for a period up to 20 years.

Myers said the 1970 total includes 428 grants, 121 loans, and 98 combinations, most of them in the Haddington and West Mill Creek renewal areas in West Philadelphia, Whitman and Pennsport in South Philadelphia, and Nicetown, Model Cities, Strawberry Mansion, and Morton in North Philadelphia.

In the development authority's major rehabilitation neighborhoods during 1970, approvals amounted to more than \$1 million in Haddington, \$342,000 in Whitman, \$316,000 in Model Cities, \$198,000 in West Mill Creek, \$197,000 in Pennsport, and \$188,000 in Nicetown.

Myers pointed out that this program has been of tremendous value in rehabilitating hundreds of homes whose owners could not otherwise have afforded the repairs, and the work is accomplished while the families remain in their homes.

VOLUNTEERS, NOT SLAVES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, for most of our Nation's history the use of involuntary conscription to raise armies has been foreign to the American character and spirit of volunteerism. At the very inception of the Republic the concept of a draft was rejected as being inconsistent with the constitutional form of government and our Founding Fathers wisely chose to depend, instead, on volunteers to meet the country's military manpower requirements.

Regrettably, the fine precedent established in our country's early years has been destroyed, and, during the 20th century, there has been a generally increasing dependence on conscription. What is worse is that involuntary military service has become nothing more than servitude and the fulfillment of one's "military obligation" has been totally corrupted. Consider the number of servicemen and their families now receiving welfare. Look at the poverty-level conditions in which many servicemen, their wives, and children are living. Let us reflect on the abridgement of certain basic rights of our servicemen. Such conditions are intolerable and are quickly leading to a complete breakdown of our military services. As the days go on, Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly clear to many of us—both in the Congress and in the private sector—that a voluntary military service is urgently required to bring an immediate end to the present chaos and to restore efficiency and confidence in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Nicholas von Hoffman of the Washington Post has recently written a very timely and perceptive article which not only comments on the infringement of certain basic rights and common decency now rampant in the Armed Forces but also reinforces—in his own particular style—the contention that volunteers can meet our military personnel needs. It is evident that such a system is more realistic and effective than the present untenable arrangement. I found Mr. von Hoffman's article to be of particular interest and importance, Mr. Speaker, and I am anxious to share it with our colleagues:

SLAVING FOR FREEDOM

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

When the American army goes tramp, tramping across the globe, marching hither and yon defending freedom and liberating people from all manner of oppression, what do the beneficiaries think? Do they reflect on the anomaly of their having their freedom protected by an army of slaves?

The ranks of our armed forces are filled by the threat of fine and imprisonment. Millions of young men, year after year, surrender their freedom for fear of jail. You don't hear people talking about the draft any more as "fulfilling your military obligations." The men who are caught by the impressment crews of the Selective Service System go because it's better than the penitentiary; to be drafted isn't a chance to serve the country, it's a catastrophically bad luck.

This kind of compulsion is involuntary servitude, in short, slavery. And if the scrupulous gentlemen who call themselves strict constructionists would read the 13th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution they might be forced to agree that it is a gross violation of fundamental law.

Our Constitution empowers Congress to raise, support and organize armies, but that's it. Nowhere is there the hint of the power to compel people to serve in them against their will. Nor can you argue that the power is inferentially there, for the Ninth Amendment says clear enough for a layman to understand that Congress only has the powers enumerated in the Constitution, no others.

The slavers and the slavemasters, President Nixon, Secretary Laird, Curtis Tarr, the field boss of the Selective Slavery System, and many, many others argue that while it might be nice to grant these young men the liberty the Constitution promises them, there are practical reasons this can't be done right now. Someday, they say, even if we won't give up conscription, maybe we'll at least have zero draft calls.

The first pro-slavery argument is that the cost of a voluntary army would be too high. This isn't so much an argument as an admission that millions of young men are driven into the armed forces because they're cheap labor.

Probably 80 per cent of what the military does could be contracted to civilian enterprises. Very few of the Pentagon functions must be carried out by men under military discipline, but it's cheaper to snap a man off the streets, pay him next to nothing and let his wife and kids live on welfare. It's also better politically because if we paid the people in the army what we pay civilians who do the same work, there would be a taxpayer's revolt that would get us out of Vietnam faster than Henry Kissinger and the other White House dialecticians ever dreamt of.

It's said that a volunteer army would produce an isolated officer corps which might attempt a coup d'etat. The draft civilianizes the army, they argue, neglecting to add that it also militarizes the society. In any event, personal liberty is an absolute right, not to be abridged by speculative hypotheses which no one can prove one way or another.

It may very well turn out that a volunteer army, even a well paid one, will be so small, that if it tries to take over, it will be disarmed by the District of Columbia police department. That's what the slavers really fear. They're not going to have all those Major Matt Mason toy soldiers to play with. In that case, they would be forced to pursue a foreign policy convincing enough to get men to want to sacrifice for it.

That may not satisfy those who're concerned with our living up to our infinite number of commitments to defend this and that all over the earth. For them a small army is a little America, an isolationist foreign policy which they will oppose with the last ounce of every man's strength who's clapped into the service against his will.

Even for them there is an alternative solution. Never forget we can buy anything including a foreign army. Raise the level of appropriations for the Food for Peace program and we'll have battalions and army corps sprouting out of the ground faster than spring wheat. There are 10 million coolies in Asia starving and waiting to be hired.

Isn't that what "Vietnamization" is? A carrying out of what President Nixon calls the Nixon Doctrine, the hiring of coolies to kill other coolies?

General Westmoreland, however, has his doubts. The ferociously handsome, the murderously attractive army chief of staff reasons that even at high wages people won't join the army if we civilians go on bad-mouthing it. The Army, the general observes

with an acuity unusual to him, is getting a bad reputation.

This he and others would blame on peace lovers and kindred undesirables, but in that he's mistaken. The deterioration of the army is a consequence of the draft. The uniformed slaves know why they are forced to serve longer sentences in the service than many a robber and hold-up man must serve in jail . . . not patriotism, but the power of the centralized state with its federal courts, marshals, district attorney and FBI agents ready to take care of them if they don't show up for induction.

That's why the army has a bad reputation. It's a place of punishment for people who've committed no crime, and the growing realization of this fact is destroying it. The sliding discipline, the riotous brawling, racial strife, the slot machines, the drinking and the dope. Can you believe it? A full Air Force colonel with 28 years service time court-martialed for smoking loco weed? And what does this say to the proposition that a young man learns citizenship, discipline and responsibility in the armed forces?

At a time when the life of the country is actually threatened, there may be good reason to suspend the Constitution and conscript people. Lincoln did, but he had an enemy army a few miles on the other side of the Potomac River, not 8,000 miles away up the Mekong River without a paddle. On the other hand, it wasn't easy for George Washington without a Selective Slavery System but he did it with volunteers who loved their country and wanted to serve it. Perhaps the men who rule from the city named after him might try the same.

LEGAL ABORTION MORALLY JUSTIFIED?

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, following is an article sent to me by a close personal friend, Dr. Joseph R. Stanton, a member of the Value of Life Committee, which appeared in the New York Times on February 18, 1971. I submit it for the perusal of my colleagues:

DECLARATION OF CONCERN

Within two weeks our nation tensely waited while her astronaut sons, Shepard, Mitchell and Roosa, with artificial life-support systems, circled the moon, walked upon it, and returned to Mother Earth. During these same two hundred and sixteen hours, an estimated two thousand embryonic Americans, with the natural life-support system of their mothers' nurturing womb, were deprived of the right to continue life and future happiness by legalized abortion.

In the last twelve months, over 75,000 innocent unborn have been destroyed in New York, and thousands more in other states of this nation. What had been evolving human beings, most often with clearly recognizable human limbs and countenances, were passed through pathology laboratories, flushed down sewers, incinerated in hospital furnaces, or in some cases cast in cellophane bags on city dumps.

Medical and para-medical personnel, joined by growing numbers of citizens, are understandably horrified by what abortion really means when recognizably human forms are being destroyed. They grow ever more critical of the claim that legalized abortion is morally justified just because human life at this level is not viable outside the life-support system of the mother's body.

How long can we meaningfully say that all men are created equal while the innocent unborn are sacrificed to personal whim, convenience, or that new test of Americanism in our increasingly technologic and impersonal age: the qualification of being perfect, or being wanted, or being viable?

AIR FORCE'S EFFICIENCY PROMOTES GREATER NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the 35th annual dinner meeting of the American Ordnance Association on February 8, 1971, Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans, Jr., delivered an informative and thoughtful address entitled "Technology As Related to National Security in the 1970's." The Secretary made the valid point that many people currently think it is "in vogue" to blame science and technology for a whole raft of problems, without stopping to consider what they have actually accomplished for us. Our standard of living, the advances in medicine, the spectacular achievements in space and our strong national defense are just some of the rewards which advancing technology has reaped for every American.

Secretary Seamans went on to address himself to one of the most important questions relating to today's defense-oriented endeavors: How should our advancing technology be managed? He explains that although errors have been made in the past regarding contracts and procedures, new policies and guidelines have now been instituted which are successfully remedying previous shortcomings. The deliberate processes by which the Air Force has moved to modify procedures and assure the maintenance of a strong and progressively more sophisticated deterrent was the central theme of the Secretary's message.

I think all Americans should be pleased when one of our armed services assesses its responsibilities and procedures, determines areas where strengthening and improvement are needed, and then diligently sets about the task of accomplishing these goals. Secretary Seamans' talk clearly illustrates that this is precisely what has been done within his realm of responsibility and I believe my colleagues will be impressed with the contents of his speech. I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TECHNOLOGY AS RELATED TO NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE 1970's

One of the greatest tasks ahead of our nation in the 1970's is to use science and technology wisely and to restore public confidence in their use. Tonight I would like to talk first about the need for advanced technology, particularly in maintaining national security, and then about our efforts in the Air Force and the Department of Defense to manage technology more effectively.

Some people have come to view science and technology as an affront to the quality of life and as the source of a never-ending arms race. Such a negative assessment can

arise from a failure to understand that it is technology that feeds, shelters and defends us and makes this nation, overall, one of the better places in the world to live. Technology has created a number of problems, but it has the potential, if used correctly, to solve those same problems—and many more.

Of course, advocating technological solutions is like the task of the county agent who was trying to teach new methods to a New England farmer. He promised: "If you try these new techniques, you will be able to farm twice as well as you do now." "Shucks, son," said the farmer, "I don't farm now half as good as I know how."

We must do a better job of applying what we know. Great technical challenges and opportunities exist today. We must use technology to reduce pollution and stop the waste of national resources. Power generation is at the root of many pollution and resource problems. And it is only through improved technology that we can solve those problems and still provide sufficient energy for the world's needs.

In the area of national security—my topic for tonight—improved technology must provide the basis for the continuing deterrence of worldwide conflict. We all hope that the SALT negotiations will be successful. But until we can achieve arms limitation agreements, military deterrent forces based on advanced technology will remain our chief safeguard against war.

Ever-changing technology also can help deter or determine the winners—and losers—in non-nuclear warfare. During World War II, science and technology acquired a large part of its favorable reputation from its contributions to our military victories. One thinks of the Spitfire and radar in the Battle of Britain, and radar again in the Pacific battles.

Technology later played a key role in the Korean War. The helicopter came into its own in rescue and medical evacuation. And our fighter aircraft with new electronic sights used their technological edge over the MIGs to excellent advantage.

In the 1960s, the Cuban missile crisis was effectively resolved, in part, as a result of sophisticated aerial photography.

Technology has also played an important role in Vietnam, particularly during the period of withdrawal of American forces. Improvements in our air operations have been possible through an array of technological advances and innovations, including developments in laser-guided missiles, the use of gunships, and the introduction of new surveillance systems such as low light level television and infrared. All of these developments have enabled airpower to deny the enemy the use of darkness as a safe haven from which to operate.

Because of the success of the Vietnamization program, U.S. Air Force fighter strength in Southeast Asia was reduced by 44% during 1970 with reduction of some 35% in sorties flown. Three-fourths of these aircraft were actually withdrawn from that area, while the remainder were transferred to the Vietnamese Air Force.

But the length and cost of the war have helped develop a negative public attitude towards military technology. This negative attitude has been reflected in a decline in defense R&D expenditures. A slight increase is proposed in FY 72, but with inflation taken into account, the level of effort will still be the lowest since 1960.

The significance of this technological slowdown can best be appreciated by considering the trends in the forces of the Soviet Union. It is hard to determine exactly what the Soviets are doing in the research and development area. But we are seeing many new weapon systems of high quality. They have flown more than a dozen new prototype fighters and bombers in the last decade compared to a total of five for the United

States. Our best estimates indicate that Soviet military R&D has almost certainly passed our own level of effort and continues to increase at a rate of over 10% per year. If Soviet R&D efforts produce some future military surprises—as they well may—then we will have paid a high price for public disillusionment with technology.

The current loss of public confidence in military technology has been accelerated by management problems associated with the development and production of a few major systems, such as the F-111, the C-5, the Cheyenne attack helicopter, and the MARK 48 torpedo.

The F-111 is one of our most publicized Air Force programs and has been the subject of a great deal of public and congressional scrutiny. As you know, we have experienced significant structural problems with this aircraft. Because of a major accident in December 1969, all F-111s were grounded and a major test and corrective program was initiated. It was pretty tough medicine to ground all those aircraft.

Our investigation revealed that the problem was one of quality control rather than design deficiency. That is, the nondestructive inspection techniques and procedures in use prior to the accident allowed a flaw in the high tensile strength material to slip through the quality control.

As a result, we have inspected the critical primary structural parts of the aircraft in great detail and are verifying the basic structural integrity of all F-111s by ground proof test at a temperature of -40° F. One by one these aircraft are put into the test cell, and with the temperature down to -40°, the wings are jacked up and the fuselage pushed down until there is a load of 7.3 Gs. We did this successfully to 286 aircraft. Then the major TV networks asked if they could film the tests. And as you are probably aware from news accounts, an aircraft in the test cell developed a crack in a plate—revealed to all present by a loud bang!

Of course, a post-production test program of this type should not be necessary. We are working hard to improve our quality control techniques earlier in the production process, but there is still a great deal to be done in advancing the state of the art.

We are making a number of major improvements in our overall approach to weapons development. These improvements not only make sense as good management, but should also help us regain public confidence in our use of defense technology.

In the past we leaned too heavily toward concurrent development and production. Tooling and production were often initiated before the development of the system was complete. In addition, we tried "total package procurement," which required the bidder to contract for the new system from the "cradle to the grave." That is, his fixed-price bid covered both development and production—and also guaranteed maintenance costs, reliability, and the cost of spares for operating the system. All of these contracting arrangements were made purely on the basis of paper studies.

We are now implementing new procurement procedures. We are separating the development contract from the production contract. And whenever possible, we are using competition in the development phase.

The competitive prototype method will permit us to base our procurement decisions on comparative hardware tests rather than paper studies. It will also provide a strong incentive for best possible contractor performance. We used this method for both the electronics and the engine for the F-15 fighter. We had a fly-off of the fire control electronics between Hughes and Westinghouse. And Pratt Whitney and GE both developed test engines. We selected Hughes on

the one hand and Pratt Whitney on the other, on the basis of actual test results.

We also provided hardware competition for the engine of the B-1 bomber. There were thousands of hours of engine component testing, as well as more than 100 hours of demonstration engine testing by GE and Pratt Whitney, before GE was chosen.

In the case of the A-X close support aircraft, the cost of development is low enough that we are going to have a fly-off of the plane itself. Northrop and Fairchild Hiller will each build two aircraft on fixed price contracts. After testing the flying prototypes, we will pick one contractor to proceed with full-scale development and production.

Our objective in developing the A-X aircraft is to provide a better capability for our assigned mission of close support for ground troops. We want to be able to operate over the battlefield at speeds low enough to provide good accuracy. To survive under those conditions, the aircraft must be capable of sustaining high load factors and must have redundant systems and good armor protection. We also want a large ordnance load and fuel for a long time over the target area. We will test avionics systems for night and all-weather operations, but such systems would be used in only a part of the force. Our principal task is to provide an aircraft that can do the job without complex subsystems and high costs. The development program will insure that we can build such a plane before we decide to go ahead with production.

It would be nice to have several companies build prototypes of every new system so that we could decide which one to buy on the basis of hardware performance. But this would cost too much for more complex systems. For the F-15 fighter and the B-1 bomber we found that over half a billion dollars would have been added to the cost.

Since we can't afford competitive prototypes in these cases and since even single contractor development will be expensive, the Air Force must be closely involved in day-to-day trade-offs. We must be able to adjust the characteristics and design of the aircraft in the face of technical and cost problems that are bound to arise. In order to obtain that sort of control and flexibility, we are using a cost plus incentive contract for the development phase. A fixed price contract will then be negotiated if the decision is made to go ahead with production.

McDonnell-Douglas was given a cost plus incentive contract for development of the F-15 with a fixed price plus incentive for the production phases. This was one of the first programs that we designed with emphasis on contract milestones. There is a thorough review at each milestone before proceeding with the next phase of development. The first two milestones—preliminary design review of the engine and the airframe—have been successfully completed.

As you know, North American Rockwell has been awarded a cost plus incentive contract for development of the B-1 bomber. The production decision will not be made until a year after the first flight which means there will be plenty of time for hardware evaluation before going ahead with the production contract.

Even though there is no competitive development, the contractor clearly has a strong incentive to do the best possible job. If he hopes to be awarded a production contract, he must keep down the cost of both development and production, while meeting essential requirements.

The B-1 is a good example of the potential contribution of advanced technology to security. Its principal purpose is to provide more effective insurance against the failure of deterrence. It must have the capability to attack and destroy enemy targets in the face of rapidly improving enemy defenses. And it must be able to accomplish its mission in

ways that are different from those built into our land- and sea-based missile forces. If it can do these things—and the Soviets realize it can do them, the risk of nuclear war can be held close to zero.

Each of our deterrent weapons poses inherently different problems for a potential aggressor. Each has its distinctive strengths. For example, our missile forces are designed to ride out the initial enemy attack, since they cannot be recalled once they are launched. The B-1, on the other hand, will be capable of wide dispersal and fast launch on warning so that it can be clear of its bases before enemy weapons arrive. Thus, even if an enemy developed the capability to destroy many of our land- and sea-based missiles before launch, that tactic would not eliminate our bombers—they would already be in the air.

Similarly, while our missile warheads follow predictable ballistic trajectories to their targets, the B-1 will have the tactical flexibility of various speeds, altitudes, and manned penetration systems, in order to fight its way to the target regardless of enemy defenses. Thus, even if an enemy developed a highly effective ABM defense against ballistic ordnance, the bomber would still be a credible deterrent.

A three-way mix of land-based missiles, sea-based missiles, and bombers greatly complicates any plans an enemy might have for launching a strategic attack and provides insurance against unexpected enemy developments which might neutralize a single type force if that were all we had available for deterrence.

The B-1 will be a considerable advance over our B-52s which first flew in 1952. It will have supersonic speed, but also low-level attack capability—the lack of which contributed to the cancellation of the B-70 bomber in the early 1960s. The B-1 will have a faster launch capability, a low radar cross-section and a large payload for penetration devices and multiple weapon systems. The B-1 should make an important contribution to deterrence for a long period of years, just as the B-52 has done before it. And it will provide additional options, short of a nuclear missile attack, which could be used in smaller conflicts, if necessary.

We are applying new management approaches to both the F-15 and B-1 programs. We are giving greater authority and responsibility to our System Program Directors in order to speed up decision making and encourage initiative.

We are also streamlining our reporting procedures. A short time ago we required some 430 types of formal reports on each major project. This was cut to about 200 for the F-15 and now to around 40 for the B-1. There will still be adequate reporting for financial management, and we will conduct extensive reviews at designated milestones as development progresses. But we expect our Air Force managers and engineers, working with the contractor, to provide early notice of development problems and fast decisions on the various tradeoffs that are possible.

These management improvements will not solve all our problems, but we believe they will help restore public confidence in Defense technology.

We must continue to work for healthy and adequate defense R&D programs. And at the same time we must look for ways in which the new technology and management techniques that we develop can be useful to the civilian sector. To the extent that we are successful in improving our defense R&D programs, the people of this country will be more inclined to support not only those programs necessary for national security, but also the proper use of technology to solve our domestic problems. Progress toward both of these objectives is essential for the future well-being of our nation.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, February 13 marked the anniversary of a country whose existence was derived from a stronger force than charters, constitutions and diplomatic recognitions. That force continues from the hearts of thousands of Lithuanians who must live their lives apart from their homeland. These are the people who were driven from Lithuania by Soviets because zealous patriotism would be a danger to Soviet subjugation.

Such are the patriots who constitute the Lithuanian community in New Jersey. On the 53d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence, the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey adopted a resolution that I wish to share with my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the 53rd Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's independence, we the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of New Jersey, assembled here on February 13, 1971, in Newark, New Jersey to:

Commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence proclaimed on February 16th, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State, having antecedents in the Lithuanian Kingdom established in 1251, was restored;

Honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters who fought to defend Lithuania's national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors;

Recall with pride the political, cultural, economic and social achievements of the Lithuanian Republic during the independence era of 1918-1940;

Express our indignation over the interruption of Lithuania's sovereign functions as a result of the military occupation of our homeland by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, during the course of which national traditions and values were trampled, the personal freedoms of the people were suppressed and hundreds of thousands of people were liquidated by the Soviet genocidal practices;

And to emphasize once again our confidence that, regardless of what methods the Soviet oppressors devise, they will, in the end, be unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights. These hopes were made most evident in the recent successful hijacking of a Soviet aircraft to Turkey by Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, as well as in Simas Kudirka's heroic attempt at defection.

Gravely concerned with the present plight of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and animated by a spirit of solidarity we, the members of the Lithuanian ethnic community of New Jersey,

Demand that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Communist "colons" from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian nation to freely exercise sovereign rights to self-determination.

We call upon our Senators and Representatives to make use of every opportunity to urge that President Nixon once again publicly reiterate the long standing United States position of non-recognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia,

and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and to raise this issue in the United Nations and at various international conferences.

Dated at Newark, New Jersey, February 13, 1971.

VALENTINAS MELINAS,
President.
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,
Secretary.

STORY OF A MODEL BOY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a tragedy which recently occurred in my congressional district. Last November 16, a bright, handsome, and diligent young man by the name of Glenn Callieham was brutally shot to death under mysterious circumstances. He was 17 years old at the time of his death.

In the February 22, 1971, edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, reporter Robert P. Daniels told the story of Glenn's life with compassion and insight and explained the frustration of his parents, who worked hard to rear him properly. The authorities believe that his death resulted from his unwillingness to steal narcotics from his father's patent medicine store.

We hear so much that is negative about youth today. Boys like Glenn, boys with hopes and dreams of self-improvement and achievement, remind us that we need not be concerned about the ability of tomorrow's leaders. Let us hope, however, that no more Glenn Calliehams are prevented from realizing their goals for such senseless reasons.

The article, "Story of a Model Boy: He Was Murdered for Doing What Was Right," follows:

STORY OF A MODEL BOY: HE WAS MURDERED FOR DOING WHAT WAS RIGHT

(By Robert P. Daniels)

The man reached to a ledge above his desk and took down a tiny plastic trophy. On its base was a tag that reads: "World's Best Dad."

It was a gift to Jerry Callieham from his son.

"To me, Glenn was something a little exceptional as a son," Jerry Callieham said. "All my plans were wrapped around him. Now I have no plans, period. When they killed Glenn, they took a whole lot out of me."

The woman, her eyes moist with tears, held a Mother's Day card. On it are the words: "To a Wonderful Mother on Mother's Day."

It came from her son.

"Glenn was the most delicate one to me," she said. "I do what I'm doing now because I have other kids. It seems I can hear Glenn saying, 'Mom, don't worry.'"

Glenn Callieham, delicate, generous and loyal son to both sides of a split family, was shot to death last November because he would not do what he thought was not right. He was 17.

His mother and father are divorced. Both have remarried.

But even separately, they brought up Glenn to do what was right.

Jerry Callieham, 39, owns a patent-medicine store. He has worked hard for what he has and he expects the same from his children.

"I always taught Glenn and all my kids to do things right," he said. "If you do things the right way, you'll be recognized."

Glenn Callieham was shot to death on his way to work at his father's store.

It happened shortly before 6 p.m. last Nov. 16, less than a block from his destination, E. 110th Street and Superior Avenue N.E.

It happened, police reported, because Glenn refused to steal.

Cleveland police believe he was asked by other boys to take medicine from which narcotics could be extracted from his father's store.

When he refused, he was killed.

Glenn Morris Callieham was born in Cleveland on April 4, 1953. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., whom the boy admired greatly, was shot to death on Glenn's 15th birthday.

"I remember the day that happened," said Mrs. Powell. "Glenn came to me and said, 'Mama, isn't it a shame that he died on my birthday?'"

Glenn considered his date of birth significant. He was an Aries and an ardent follower of his horoscope. A symbol of Aries, the ram, hung on a chain around his neck.

He had been following astrological forecasts in the days before he died. He told his mother he was prone to death by accident.

Mrs. Powell said: "He told me one time that his horoscope said he could walk out any day and get killed."

Perhaps not any day. Thursday is the lucky day for Aries. Monday is the unlucky day.

The day Glen was shot, his horoscope read: "Home affairs can be quite difficult. Make sure you do not add to the disturbance, or there can be real trouble."

After he was shot, Glenn made his way to his father's store. There, he collapsed on the floor. He was dead.

It happened on a Monday.

People born under the sign of Aries are said to be affectionate and faithful. They are exceptionally generous; they have a lot of friends.

That was Glenn Callieham.

"He was free-hearted and kind," said his mother, "never a hard-headed child. Sometimes I thought he was a little too good. He didn't think anyone would harm him or anything like that."

"He didn't watch people. He thought everybody was his friend. He'd say, 'Anything I have, my friends can have,' and sometimes if a friend of his was having trouble, he'd come to me about it."

Evidence of his generosity abounds.

In his father's store, Jerry's Patent Medicines, 11002 Superior, his father keeps a cigarette lighter the boy gave him. It's attractive and unusual, shaped like an old flintlock pistol. Glenn also gave his father a desk set.

"He'd always give me a big card and a wonderful gift for Mother's Day," said Mrs. Powell, who lives at 3771 E. 142d Street.

"Just look around this house and you can see them—the clock on the wall, the toaster, things like that. Sometimes he would buy me candy."

"One Sweetest Day he came up to me with his hands behind him and said, 'Mama, I didn't get you anything for Sweetest Day, just this little card.' I read the card, and then Glenn pulled a box of candy out from behind him and gave it to me. He was forever doing things like that."

"Another time he bought my husband (Horace Powell, 50) a little radio he could plug in his ear and hear church music on Sundays. He just said, 'Here, Horace, this is for you.'"

Glenn's friends were numerous at John F. Kennedy High School, where he was a senior,

in the neighborhood where he lived and at the store.

Perhaps his closest friends were classmates Fred Burt, 17, of 14008 Glendale Avenue S.E., and Edmund Wilson, also 17, formerly of 3566 E. 149th Street and now living with an uncle at Otis Air Force Base, Mass.

"We were very, very close," said Edmund. "Most people say we were like brothers. I feel as though he was my closest friend."

Despite his slender build (5 feet 10, 140 pounds), Glenn was athletic and liked most sports. Because he worked, he did not play at JFK.

"He played basketball and baseball and he liked track," said Edmund. "We spent a lot of time in my backyard playing basketball."

"There would be Glenn, Fred, Dave (Thomas), my cousin Arthur (Wilson) and me. The days we didn't have to work, we'd play from morning 'til night."

"He also liked to go to parties and talk to the women and make people laugh. He liked music a lot. Just before he died he got interested in hard rock."

"He liked Jimi Hendrix and the Iron Butterfly, but I'd say his favorite artists were the Temptations and Tom Jones. He had a lot of records by them."

"He also used to talk about getting married," said Fred. "That's something he was looking forward to."

"And he talked a lot about his father. He wasn't going to forget what he did for him. Glenn was really good about his family. Anytime he was going to be out past a certain hour, he'd call the house and say if he was going to be home or not."

The person he talked about marrying is India Simpson, 18, of 16220 Stockbridge Avenue S.E. She said he talked about it occasionally when they were alone.

"He'd talk about things like that," she said, "and about the future. He told me he'd like to have a good job, that he didn't want to be a bum."

Miss Simpson saw Glenn the afternoon he was killed. He had stopped at her house after school, then went home to rest before work.

"I was sick and had been to the doctor," she said, "and Glenn came over later. We were sitting there talking about Christmas."

"Glenn said he was going to give me a big Christmas present and he was telling me what he wanted. He said he wanted a watch. He was showing me the kind he wanted in one of those gift catalogs."

Fred and Edmund drove him from India's house to his own.

"As he got out of the car he said, 'I'll see you all later,'" Edmund recalled. "I was going to call him later and see what was happening that weekend. We were sort of planning on going to Akron."

"We were going to take the ladies (Miss Simpson and Loretta Owens, who also works in Callieham's store) someplace special. We wanted to go to someplace out of town, someplace different."

"Fred and I were at work (Zappone's Olive and Grape Restaurant, 26300 Chagrin Boulevard, Woodmere). Then my cousin Marcus (Wilson), came and told me that Glenn got shot, and I didn't believe it."

"Fred called the store, but he couldn't ask about it because he was afraid. So I grabbed the phone and asked. Glenn's stepmother (Mrs. Ann Callieham) was there and she told me."

"It shocked me. I told Fred and Dave and the rest of the friends and they were all shocked."

Glenn Callieham is remembered by others as a gentle young man who liked to have fun and liked others to have fun. He did not like violence.

He was a good pupil—a potentially better one—who earned only one C through his first six years of school. The rest were A's and B's.

His grades weren't as good in high school, but he was working, had more outside interests. They could have been as good.

Glenn was giving serious thought to a career in pharmacy. He wanted to enroll in college next fall. He had not applied for admission because he did not have a particular school in mind. He knew that he wanted to go to a school out of town.

"We were together a lot for about the last two weeks before he was killed," said Rex Harrison, 17, of 13208 Edgewood Avenue S.E.

"He was always easy-going and carefree. He liked to go to parties a lot. He went to quite a few of what you might call the high spots. He liked to dance and he liked music.

"I was over to his house on the Saturday night before he was shot, I talked to him on Sunday and on Monday I saw him here in school. And that was that."

"He always said he didn't like fights," said Miss Simpson. "He used to joke about it. He said if he ever got into a fight, he'd run."

"Glenn wasn't the type you'd figure something like this would happen to," said his brother, Levester Calleham, 21, the eldest of Jerry Calleham's children.

"He was very quiet until you really got to know him. When I heard what happened, I didn't believe it. It's even hard to believe today.

"Now over at my mother's house there's no music played or anything. All the good records are Glenn's, and no one feels much like playing them anymore."

Levester Calleham was with an Army supply outfit in Long Binh, South Vietnam, when his brother died.

He received a 30-day emergency leave and was given an extension when he got home. He has since applied to the Army for a compassionate reassignment to a base close to home. A decision is pending.

"I think Glenn and I were closer when we were younger," he said, "but just before I went into the Army, we were coming back closer again. I was looking forward to the time when he was 21 and we could do some more things together."

He remembers his father teaching the children in the family to do right.

Well, in every family, you have one parent you sort of fear or something, and one you more or less lean on if you do something wrong; one you can talk to, who will try to get the other one to go easy on you.

"We always tried to do right in our family because of what father might say if we didn't. We weren't so much afraid that he'd whip us or anything for what we did; it was what he'd say about it."

The father wipes his damp eyes with a handkerchief and remembers when he and his family were young.

"I got married young and I grew up with my kids," he said. "I think we all learned a lot. I've found out that when a person is determined and wants to make a go of it, he can do it."

"I learned that I could make a go of it, because I always seemed to not let little things get in the way."

"I think my kids learned that, too. They know that daddy stands for certain things, and they've had to learn to accept the fact that he'll always be daddy and that he's not going to take certain things from them."

"The times I remember most with Glenn are the times we went to ball games together. I used to take Junior (Levester) to a ball game once in a while, and then one day Glenn said to me, 'Now it's time to take me to a ball game.'"

"So, I said, 'When you come to work Sunday, we'll take off and go to the football game.' And we went down to see the Browns. Going to ball games together . . . football, baseball. He was crazy about all of them."

Glenn also liked to have a good time with his mother.

"He liked to play around with me, like brother and sister," said Mrs. Powell. Sometimes when he was playing he'd call me Thelma.

"Thelma,' he'd say, 'how about fixing me a hamburger?' And I'd say to him, 'Boy, I'm going to fix you a hamburger, all right, but I'm doing it because I was going to fix them anyway.' And then we'd laugh."

"He was very neat. He didn't like beards and all that. He always kept his Afro trimmed and neat. He wanted his clothes to be neat, too. He wanted his shirts clean and ironed and he liked a crease in his trousers, even in his blue jeans."

(The day Glenn was killed he was wearing neatly creased bell-bottom blue jeans, an expensive—\$40—sweater, an overcoat with a fur collar, and a black, wide-brimmed hat, currently a popular item among black youngsters. He bought the clothes with his earnings from his job at the store.)

Tributes to his character are many. No one can remember a bad thing about him. He was, it seems clear, the kind of young man every parent wants his child to be.

"He was just a nice boy who never did bother anybody," said Willie Harvey, who works at the store and who had known Glenn from the day he was born. "He always was quiet and minded his own business."

"I loved Glenn," said Mrs. Sara Pettit, who worked with Glenn for four years. "I worked with him a lot decorating the windows and things. There was nothing he wouldn't or couldn't do. I took him just like one of my own."

"It seemed to me like he was always happy," said Miss Owens, a 1970 graduate of Jane Addams Vocational High School. "He liked to tease me a lot. He always kept us laughing."

"He was a tall, handsome child," said his stepmother. "He was a wonderful child. His father tried very hard to show him the right way to go."

"It's very soft around here now. It's very difficult to talk about him anymore."

Glenn and his stepmother also were very close. He often gave her cards and presents, and she let him drive her car. She had planned to take him downtown shopping Tuesday, the day after he died.

"Glenn didn't try to be like anyone else," said his sister, Katrina (Mrs. Elliott Hollinger, 20). "He had a dream of his own, and he knew it would make his mother and his father happy. He knew it would have been good for both of them."

"He was his own person, his own identity. He wouldn't say, 'I'm this or I'm that or I'm black.' He'd say, 'I'm Glenn Calleham.' Glenn had the one idea that he had to go to school to make it. He knew what he wanted and he knew what he had to do to get it."

"Since this happened, I don't work at the store anymore. Remembering Glenn there, thinking about him, got to be too much for me. I got a nervous stomach from it. There are a lot of people who don't want to work for what they have. Not Glenn. He worked hard for what he had."

Alan J. Klein, Glenn's guidance counselor at JFK, said: "Glenn was what a lot of kids wanted to be and couldn't make."

Frank Jasko, his black history teacher in Room 341, called him "gregarious, the curious type" who took part in classroom discussions.

"Anything I can think of about him is completely favorable," said Jasko. "That's the kind of young man he was."

"He was well-liked by the other students," said Melvyn M. Gross, assistant principal. "I think they admired him most because he was working toward his own cause in a good way."

Gross remembered the week Glenn was shot.

"What you probably don't know is that our students had a double shock that week," he said. "About the time Glenn was shot, Mr. Cowley (Willard B.), one of our math teachers, died."

"The characteristics of both were very similar. Like Glenn, Mr. Cowley was always smiling. And like Glenn, he was well-liked by the students."

(Mr. Cowley, who lived at 20517 Raymond Avenue, Maple Heights, died Nov. 17, the day after Glenn was shot. He had been a teacher in Cleveland public schools for many years.)

"We had a memorial program here in school for both of them," said Gross. "There were two chairs on the stage draped in black to represent them. The auditorium was filled with students and the service was broadcast throughout the school."

"Here's how strong the reaction to their deaths was: There wasn't an incident of any kind here the day of the service."

If Glenn had been under pressure to steal medicine from his father's store, he didn't tell anyone about it, didn't show any concern.

The night before he was killed, he relaxed at the dining room table by working on a project he was doing in crayon for an art appreciation class.

It is a mass of many-colored rectangles on a large sheet of paper. There is a blank area along the left side of the sheet; the right end is solid black.

He called it "World of Confusion."

Everyone who knew him well said he would have mentioned it if he had been threatened and had taken the threat seriously.

Police have arrested a 15-year-old boy who lived in Glenn's neighborhood. He is accused of the shooting. It is to be decided March 8 whether his case will be handled as that of an adult or a juvenile.

"I knew my boy," said Mrs. Powell. "If he was worried, he'd show it. One boy he would always tell if anything was wrong was Edmund, and he never said a thing about it to Edmund."

"If anybody had threatened him even once, he'd tell me," said Edmund. "He'd get mad. He'd say, 'Look, man, this dude is trying to mess up my life.' He didn't like that kind of stuff."

"I guess he didn't think anything of it, or he would have told me and Ed," said Fred. "If he had, we'd have gone to see about it."

The day Glenn died, his mother had awakened him about 5:10 p.m. to get ready for work.

"He got up and put on his clothes," she said. "I was cooking liver, lima beans and corn bread, and I asked him if he wanted a T-bone, because he didn't like liver very well."

"He said, 'Just have it ready when I get home tonight.' And when he walked out the door, he said, 'I'm going, Mama.' I didn't go to the door with him that day."

Glenn's father had hoped the boy would become a pharmacist. He would have expanded the store and given Glenn increased responsibility when he was through school.

One time he gave Glenn a booklet on pharmacy, hoping to stir his interest. Later, he learned the boy had signed out books at the library on the subject and was reading them on his own.

Glenn Calleham was growing up the way his father had hoped he would.

"It seems like I've had two families, my family at home and this store," Calleham said. "I haven't always been able to spend as much time with the children as I'd like to."

"But I always tried to get across to them that I loved them. I wanted them to know that."

"I wonder if Glenn really knew it?"

The father is pensive. He stares at the wall behind his desk. He clasps his hands and leans forward with his chin on his thumbs.

"He had to," he whispers. "He had to."

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation similar to the general revenue sharing bills which I joined in introducing earlier this month. At that time I stated that the enactment of general revenue sharing would establish precedents, for the first time in our Nation's recent history, to yield some of the Federal Government's tax jurisdiction to levels of government which are closer to the people.

In the past 2 weeks, I have had the opportunity of studying further the matter of general revenue sharing. Although I believe it represents the best first step toward implementing the American tradition of having governmental powers located physically as close to the taxpayer as is practicable, it contains one basic flaw.

For general revenue sharing to work most effectively, the pass-through formula for funds going directly to counties and cities must be equitable. That is why I am today introducing revised legislation. The only difference between my bill and the earlier bill is the formula for determining the amount to be passed through the States to cities and counties.

Many areas of high concentrations of population have not incorporated as cities. Instead, they have provided essential services through independent school districts, special sanitation districts, special fire districts, special water districts, special recreation districts, and other special districts. The residents of these areas have taxed themselves accordingly to pay for the services provided by the special districts, and I believe that a system of general revenue sharing, based on revenue effort, should take the tax burden of special districts into consideration when determining the pass through to cities and counties.

The original revenue sharing bill does not do this. Each local government's share is to be determined by obtaining a percentage. The percentage would be based on the ratio of the local government's general revenue to all local government general revenue in the State. Unfortunately, the formula does not take into account independent school district taxes and special district taxes—only those taxes collected directly by municipalities and counties. This is unfair. A tax is a tax regardless of who collects it.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, corrects this inequity. It provides that each local government's share will be based on a ratio of the local government's general revenue plus the general revenue raised by other units of government within the local government's geographical boundaries to the general revenue raised by local governments and other governmental units throughout the State.

If, through general revenue sharing, our goal is the strengthening of local government, then it is imperative that we allow each locality a free hand in deter-

mining how it can best provide the services sought. I do not mean to be critical of the administration for the formula inequities which are present in the original bill. We are pioneering a whole new concept in the distribution of Federal resources, and accordingly there are bound to be initial flaws. However these flaws should be corrected before the concept reaches the House floor. My bill is designed to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for early hearings on general revenue sharing, and I urge all of my colleagues to carefully consider the more equitable pass-through formula I have included in my revised bill.

PHILADELPHIA UNCLOGS SEWER INLETS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, by rough measure, water department crews have removed 2.5 million cubic feet of debris from sewer inlets in the past 19 months, Commissioner Samuel S. Baxter said today. This amount of debris would fill the intersection of Broad and Chestnut Streets, to a height of 368 feet—37 feet higher than the Philadelphia National Bank Building.

Baxter said that since the mayor's "War on Dirt" began in mid-1969, the department's crews have done 107,000 inlet cleanings. As a result, most of the city's 100,000 sewer inlets have been cleaned at least once, and some several times.

The cost of the inlet cleaning program for the 2-year fiscal period from July 1, 1969 through June 30, 1971 is estimated at \$2,933,000. This includes \$2,100,000 for personnel (both permanent and temporary), \$119,000 for materials and supplies, \$91,000 for rental of vehicles and services, and \$623,000 for purchase of new inlet-cleaning vehicles.

It is estimated that inlet cleanings in the 2-year period will total 135,000 by June 30, 1971.

Baxter noted that in the past, because of inadequate manpower and equipment, it sometimes took several weeks for crews to clean some inlets, after these had been reported clogged. Now, however, the time lapse has been reduced to 6 days or less for most inlets, and by spring this time lag will be further shortened. Emergency jobs, of course, are done immediately or within a few hours.

Baxter said that the department's improved record stems from more funds, larger manpower, and newer equipment. Today the cleaning force has 105 permanent workers, compared with only 36 in mid-1969. It also has 43 vehicles that are used for cleaning. Seventeen of these were freshly purchased last December, and several other new units were bought in the previous year.

Thanks to more manpower and better equipment, cleaning is no longer confined to emergencies. Much inlet clean-

ing is now being done on a scheduled basis, neighborhood by neighborhood. This helps to clear up in advance some conditions that favor flooding, odors, rats and insects.

Baxter said that the clogged-inlet backlog now numbers only a few hundred at any given time. This is in contrast to a backlog of 18,000 reported inlets and many thousands of unreported inlets in August 1969.

MILITARY BUDGET CAN BE CUT BY \$10 BILLION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I, and a great many other people, have long said that our military budget can be cut in the neighborhood of between \$8 and \$15 billion, depending on which authority you listen to.

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year, Dr. Carl Kaysen, the director of the Institute for Advanced Study and former Deputy Special Assistant to President Kennedy for National Security Affairs, gave a rather detailed explanation of how \$10 billion could be trimmed from the current \$73 military budget.

To those who believe such a cut would make the United States vulnerable to a sneak Soviet attack, Dr. Kaysen's reductions would affect only nonnuclear forces.

Roland A. Paul, writing in the February 12 New York Times, discusses Dr. Kaysen's analysis.

Paul concludes, and rightly so:

These reductions are being proposed because American interests abroad can be adequately protected with a smaller American force . . .

I am inserting Mr. Paul's thoughtful article in the RECORD and urge that my colleagues read his report of Dr. Kaysen's study:

THE \$10 BILLION MISUNDERSTANDING
(By Roland A. Paul)

WASHINGTON.—Last November Dr. Carl Kaysen, the director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and a former deputy special assistant to President Kennedy for national security affairs, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad. There was no press coverage for Dr. Kaysen's testimony because public attention was absorbed at that time by the dramatic raid on the North Vietnamese P.O.W. camp at Son Tay. Nevertheless, Dr. Kaysen had a very important message to deliver—the defense budget for non-nuclear forces, in his opinion, could in the next year or so be reduced by \$10 billion.

I would like to explain how this savings of \$10 billion can be achieved, based upon Dr. Kaysen's testimony and the work done by the Brookings Institution, which Dr. Kaysen referred to in his testimony.

The 1971 defense budget of about \$73 billion is composed of \$18 billion for strategic (nuclear) forces, \$11 billion as the incremental costs of the Vietnam war this year and \$44 billion for the base line general purpose forces, i.e., the pre-Vietnam Army divi-

sions, Air Force wings and Navy task forces at 1971 prices. It is out of this \$44 billion which Dr. Kaysen and Dr. William Kaufmann, who did the basic work for Brookings, believe that \$10 billion can be saved.

Let me first show the savings that could be achieved among the Army and Marine Corps divisions, and then indicate the parallel savings within the Navy and Air Force. The nineteen and two-thirds Army and Marine Corps divisions which we have today (we had nineteen and one-third in 1964) are roughly allocable eight to Europe, eight to Asia, one to other regions and two and one-third to a strategic reserve.

Some of these, though allocable to a contingency beyond our borders, are, of course, stationed within the United States. Until the recently announced doctrine of the Administration that the United States will henceforth stand ready to engage in one and one-half major contingencies, namely, one in Europe or one in Asia and a minor contingency elsewhere, it becomes clear that we do not need to have the same number of active divisions for an Asian contingency as for a European contingency.

Instead, Dr. Kaysen and Dr. Kaufmann recommend reducing the eight active divisions allocable to Asia by six, leaving two active divisions in being as an immediate force available for an Asian contingency. Since each division deactivated represents an annual savings of \$800 million, such a reduction in itself would represent an annual savings of \$4.8 billion.

Similarly under the one and one-half wars doctrine, three wings of tactical aircraft and six naval carrier task forces could be cut. The elimination of the three air wings would mean a savings of more than \$1 billion annually and the elimination of the six task forces would constitute an annual savings of \$3 billion. Additional savings among the antisubmarine warfare carriers and airlift and sealift forces would make the total savings about \$10 billion.

Such savings would still leave the United States with forces actually in the Pacific of one, and possibly two, carrier task forces (with one or two backup task forces), four Air Force wings, two ground divisions and, if those divisions were Marine Corps divisions, two additional air wings (since Marine air is integral to the Marine Corps divisions).

Some of these forces recommended for reduction are now in Vietnam. Five of the eight base line divisions mentioned above as allocable to Asia are there. What is recommended, then, is that as Vietnamization occurs and the United States withdraws from a combat role in Southeast Asia, we should demobilize not only those units which represent the special augmentation for that conflict but also units that would have been in existence had there been no such war.

The recent announcement by the Secretary of Defense that he expects an increase in the defense budget suggests that he does not contemplate making all the reductions which I have outlined above, especially since further savings should be possible in Vietnam as we reduce our \$11 billion commitment there.

It is not absolutely necessary that the total savings come solely from forces allocated to an Asian contingency. They could also be taken from the eight Army divisions allocable to Europe, the one allocable to other regions, or the two and one-third allocable to the strategic reserve. We also have sixteen Air Force air wings allocable to Europe, which could bear part of the Air Force reduction.

A current myth about such reductions in American manpower should be laid to rest. This myth is that such reductions are tantamount to a return to the doctrine of massive retaliation. This is not so. These reductions are being proposed because American interests abroad can be adequately protected

with a smaller American force in being in light of the reduced risk of overt aggression against those interests today, both in Europe and in Asia. The flexible response policy would continue, but with greater peacetime efficiency.

KEEP THE HOSPITALS OPEN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 23, the Comptroller General of the United States held that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has no legal right to close the country's eight remaining Public Health Service hospitals. This reaffirms my belief that the administration's action was precipitate and ill considered.

Adequate medical care for all Americans has been declared a right—a right just as precious as our four freedoms: the freedom of religion, of assembly, of speech, of the press.

Decent, professional medical care for all today stands upon the threshold of becoming our fifth freedom—the freedom from the fear that the lack of a dollar will result in the lack of life-giving medical care.

Who is it that has made this declaration?

The answer, of course, is the American people—the only truly effective voice in our democratic society.

Adequate medical care—in one form or another—now holds top priority among a vast majority of those of us who stand for election, be we Democrats or Republicans. Adequate medical care—in their own self-protective style—is now the chief topic of debate among the mossbacks of the American Medical Association.

There can be no stopping the adoption of legislation that will bring to Americans the right to be protected against disease and death.

And so it is with unbelievable irony that the current administration's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would take a step backward in proposing that the first—and most efficient—form of Government-supported medical care be dismantled.

I speak of the proposition to close the eight remaining hospitals in the U.S. Public Health Service.

The proposition is bewildering. It is unreal. It is foolhardy. It goes against commonsense. And it runs counter to the obvious demand by the American people to provide far, far more—and not less—medical care for all citizens.

We in the House of Representatives have been stunned by the suggestion that the Public Health Service hospitals be closed.

And we have reacted.

My last count shows that 244 Congressmen—16 more than a majority—have cosponsored a resolution calling for the modernizing, upgrading, and expansion of all of the existing facilities of the Public Health Service.

We have done this because we know—

as many of you know—that the U.S. Public Health Service hospitals are meeting today's medical care demands today.

We know that they are efficient. We know that they provide more than a half million Americans—many of them members of the seafaring community—with professional, effective medical care each year.

We know that within the Public Health Service hospital program there lies the seed for a program of the finest medical care for all Americans.

There is, as many of you know, a definite cleavage as to the method that will be used to provide universal medical care.

President Nixon last Thursday issued a message outlining a rather involved program that would expand private health insurance to pay much of the cost of our medical bills.

Employed citizens would pick up much of the cost, either directly or through deferred wages that employers would be required to place in funds to pay for the insurance.

I found an interesting statement in the President's message—one that indicates that someone in the administration is either out of step or out of tune. For the President said, and I quote:

Rather than giving up on a system which has been developing impressively, we should work to bring about further growth which will fill the gaps we have identified.

I want to agree with the President.

I strongly believe we should not give up on the Public Health Service's system of medical care that since 1798 has been providing quality medical care for a wide range of beneficiaries—and which has made the men of the American Merchant Marine the healthiest in the world.

And, along with a majority of my colleagues in the House, I believe that we should "further the growth" of the Public Health Service facilities—and that through this action, we will help to "fill in the gaps" that exist in all phases of American medical care.

Frankly, I am appalled that the intent of the Congress to strengthen the Public Health Service hospital system—shown time and time again over the past 15 years—has been ignored by the administration.

Congress in 1956, and in 1966, and in 1970, broadened the responsibilities of the Public Health Service so it could provide comprehensive health care for merchant seamen, for Coast Guardsmen, for military personnel and their families.

Congress added to the Public Health Service the duty of establishing and operating a preventive medical care program for urban and rural families with inadequate medical facilities.

We have seen quite clearly the potential to build an efficient network of fine medical care upon the foundation of an established and honored system of health care facilities.

And still, in February of 1971, we find the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wanting to abolish the Public Health Service hospitals at a time when the President is saying we should enhance what we have in the field of medical care.

Yes, these are ironic times.

For the past 5 years, Congress has appropriated funds to modernize the Public Health Service hospitals. And for the past 5 years, the Federal Government has seen fit to ignore these appropriations—to let the facilities physically deteriorate in direct violation of the intent of the Congress to expand the hospitals and to keep them up to date.

Each time a movement begins to improve on the Public Health Service facilities, the buck is passed—in the name of the dollar.

Each time any program of national health care is mentioned, there are those who argue that with only the Federal Government keeping watch, costs would spiral into orbit.

Let us take a look at the record.

It currently costs \$55 a day to provide medical care for a patient in a Public Health Service hospital.

For care that is no better—and in many cases not as good—the cost in a private or voluntary hospital per patient day is nearly \$100.

Nor is cost the only benefit of the Public Health Service hospitals.

Waiting lists prevail in private, voluntary, and Veterans' Administration hospitals in most areas.

To place the burden of an additional half million patients on these facilities is simply unthinkable. The result would be chaotic.

The victims would be the patients—Americans who have relied upon the Public Health Service hospitals for excellence in medical care.

We cannot—we will not—let this happen.

We in Congress are determined to turn the direction of the Public Health Service hospitals—to modernize and expand this vital arm of American health care. Nothing less will do.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great Lithuanian people on the occasion of the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

This distinguished anniversary serves to remind us of our longstanding commitment to freedom, while at the same time bringing to mind the fact that the cherished blessings of liberty must never be taken for granted. It is well to note that this memorable event will not be commemorated by Lithuanians in their own nation, because of their unfortunate subjugation to the Soviet Union.

The tragedy of World War I had the crowning achievement of freeing the gallant Lithuanian people from the bondage imposed for over a century by the tyrants of Russia. For the next 22 years, after they proudly proclaimed their national

independence, they knew the blessings of peace, freedom, and prosperity.

However, as a consequence of World War II, Lithuania and its Baltic neighbors were subjected first to the brutality of the Nazi hordes, after which they were tyrannized by the ruthless oppression of the mighty Soviet machine of mechanical men, who fear liberty and are sustained by oppression.

I join with free men everywhere with a fervent hope and prayer that the distinguished and noble people of Lithuania will soon be freed from bondage by their Soviet masters, and take their rightful place in the family of nations.

REPLY TO MR. PHILLIPS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kevin P. Phillips, author of the Nixon administration's southern strategy, recently wrote a column in the Washington Post and several other newspapers entitled "U.S. is unique in helping blacks." Because of the blatant racism evident in that commentary, a brief reply is in order for the benefit of my colleagues and constituents.

Mr. Phillips' thesis is that President Nixon should meet with the black congressional caucus, of which I am a member, and explain to us the many things his administration is doing for black Americans. Further, asserts Phillips, the programs and policies now in effect to benefit blacks are not only adequate but also unique to America, this land of golden opportunity.

Let me suggest that Mr. Phillips' analysis of black people's needs is as faulty as his knowledge of American political, social, and economic history. Underlying his article are two erroneous assumptions: First, that black Americans are an "ethnic minority" comparable to such groups as Basques in Spain, Algerians in France, or French Canadians in Canada; and second, that, like these groups, blacks should not expect to receive Federal aid to help them cause trouble. Phillips stated:

Foreigners shrink from the idea of giving ethnic minorities public funds to organize and foment insurgency against the surrounding majority community.

The first assumption is fallacious because the history of black people in America is clearly distinguishable from that of any of the ethnic groups Phillips mentioned and, indeed, any ethnic group in any country. This is evident from the fact that blacks were brought to this country as slaves, that our status in the political and economic framework of this country was that of personal property and that, notwithstanding emancipation, blacks were and still are subject to severe deprivations on the ground of race. If this history of oppression is to be changed, steps must be taken without regard to whether or not there are parallels in foreign countries.

The second assumption is not only wrong but a cruel insult to all black Americans. To equate the efforts of blacks to overcome centuries of oppression with fomenting "insurgency against the surrounding majority community" is sheer racism. It is painfully ludicrous to describe as "insurgents" the sick and hungry child, his older brother who cannot read, his mother who must have access to a day care center in order to work and his father who has been denied access to education and vocational training, all living in substandard housing and eating what little they can. It is worse to call efforts to break this vicious circle of poverty "tomfoolery." As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said:

It is a cruel thing to tell a man to lift himself up by his bootstraps when he has no feet.

Mr. Phillips concludes that Federal programs designed to make blacks the first class citizens we have never been are the result of a national "guilt feeling." This may be true. But never in my studies, my travels or my experience have I ever discovered a country where such a feeling is more justified.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Phillips also needs to meet with the black congressional caucus.

FASCELL PROPOSES DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR FIRE SERVICE PERSONNEL

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce today a resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as National Fire Service Recognition Day.

Most citizens are unaware of the diversity of public services performed by our firefighters, fire inspectors, and emergency rescue personnel. Their dedication and willingness to sacrifice all for the safety of others sets an example of public service worthy of recognition.

In addition to honoring our fire service personnel, this special day would be an appropriate time for educating the public about potential hazards in home and industry; available services; and new techniques of fire prevention and safety.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to the text of this resolution and urge that they join in supporting this long overdue recognition of our dedicated fire service personnel.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 390

Whereas the fire service of our Nation performs many public services in addition to the suppression of fire, such as home inspections, prefire planning, inspections of industrial and commercial facilities, rescue and emergency services, and many others;

and Whereas public attention should be invited periodically to the varied and professional-type services rendered by the fire service of our Nation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second Saturday in May of each year is designated as "Fire Service Recognition Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENIOR CITIZENS HURT BY INFLATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the present wealth of this Nation is attributable to a large extent to our senior citizens. They have worked and produced in what is now often wistfully regarded as a less complicated age, but what in reality was an age with much fewer employee protections, fewer job safeguards, inferior medical care, longer workweeks, and fewer conveniences. It was their generation that struggled through the Depression, and their efforts helped to put this country back on its feet after that time of national crisis. Yet they receive scant thanks. The money they worked so hard to earn and to save is now being consumed by a steady inflation, brought about to a large extent by misallocation of our national resources. The social security system, started with their contributions, now returns to them benefits that practically preclude their living in decency. They are a group that truly can be called forgotten since the per capita appropriations for programs beneficial to them are among the lowest in the Nation.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, has for years been the champion of our senior citizens. Although keenly aware of the need to avoid waste, he never tried to economize at their expense. The Senator has been a valiant spokesman, making sure that our Nation does not forget those to whom it owes so much.

I am proud to be the House sponsor of a measure that the Senator from New Jersey has introduced in the other body on Tuesday. The measure we are sponsoring would go a long way toward assuring a measure of equity for our senior citizens. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and give hereby an outline of its main provisions:

BENEFIT INCREASES

A 15-percent across-the-board benefit increase, retroactive to January 1, 1971, would be provided for by this bill. In addition, there is provision for an automatic adjustment, on an annual basis for each 3-percent rise in the cost-of-living, should Congress fail to take steps to adjust payments. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should be authorized to conduct a study and consider methods of adjusting benefits based on increases in productivity and the standard of living.

Minimum benefits for single persons, now \$64 per month, would be raised to \$100 this year and \$120 in 1972.

The across-the-board increase, coupled with the increase of benefits for single persons, would serve to lift large numbers of the elderly out of poverty.

EARNINGS TESTS

The amount of earnings exemptions would be raised to \$2,100 annually.

WIDOWS' BENEFITS

Widows would receive 100 percent of the benefits due their deceased husbands, the primary beneficiary, rather than the 82½ percent that they are now allocated.

AGE 62 COMPUTATION POINT FOR MEN

This measure provides for equal treatment of men and women with respect to the age-computation point.

PART B PREMIUM COSTS ELIMINATED

Part B supplementary medical insurance premiums—now \$5.30 per month—would be eliminated. This would result in sizable savings for the elderly, since the premiums are scheduled to be increased to \$5.60 effective this coming July. Under this amendment to the Social Security Act, financing for part B would be provided from payroll taxes and matching contributions from the Federal Government.

MEDICARE COVERAGE EXTENDED TO PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Presently prescription drugs are not covered by medical coverage provided for the elderly, often forcing the aged into the cruel dilemma of choosing between necessary drugs and essential food. The proposed amendment would extend medicare coverage to prescription drugs.

DISABLED PERSONS UNDER 65 INCLUDED UNDER MEDICARE

Disabled persons, receiving social security, would be included in the medicare coverage, although not yet 65.

GENERAL REVENUE FINANCING

Today's method of financing social security and medicare largely through payroll tax deductions places a regressive tax on workers. Individuals with lower earnings end up paying a larger percentage of their incomes toward financing these programs. Our proposed measure would provide for the use of general revenues to help correct existing deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, this measure is well worthy of the support of every Member of this House. I would urge my colleagues to study the measure and give it their serious consideration.

LOUIS K. MULFORD CELEBRATES 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, February 26 marks the 100th birthday of Louis K. Mulford of Wheat Ridge, Colo., formerly of Montclair, N.J.

On this happy occasion, I wish to congratulate him and to extend to him my warmest good wishes for continued happiness and an abundance of satisfaction.

LETTER OF GI WOUNDED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter the parents of SF3 Gordon Clissham, Jr., U.S. Navy, received from his unit commander after Gordon was wounded in Vietnam. It is always pleasant to know how well a young man has served his country—especially when his commander can speak so highly of that service. I certainly share Gordon's parents' pride in the following report.

I include the material as follows:

DECEMBER 25, 1970.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. CLISHAM: Normally, platoon commanders don't write to next of kin unless a man is killed; which fortunately is not the case with Gordon. These letters can be a great pain as one is supposed to say all kinds of nice things about people about whom not many nice things can be said. This letter is particularly easy to write, as I don't have to fabricate any good qualities that did not exist.

Prior to bringing this platoon to Vietnam, I was operations officer for SEAL Team One and one of my biggest jobs was assigning people to the platoons as they were prepared for deployment. My platoon was pretty well filled up before I even realized I would be platoon commander, as I had originally been planning to get out of the Navy in October. When it came time to fill out the remaining six or so slots, I asked the chief in charge of SEAL training to give me two good guys, two medium guys and two bananas from his last class. Gordon's name was put up as the best of the class and I promptly scarfed him up.

Throughout predeployment training he was a real help, as he was always willing to do just about anything that had to be done and myself, my assistant and leading petty officer, came to rely upon him to get things done that we wanted to get done right the first time without having to check up on it every minute. We spent quite a bit of time together during this period, since he would generally ride with me when we drove anywhere. I always got a kick out of the fact that he had more jobs than I could imagine he had time to hold down. If we passed a construction gang, he would say that he had a job doing that one time and how he liked it or didn't like it, or that he worked for a motel and took revenge on a vending machine company or all kinds of different jobs. He might not have told you, but he is still taking revenge on vending machines; we had to hide him in the air craft in Guam after he busted up a sandwich machine in the barracks there.

Once we got in the country he acted as point man for my squad and for the platoon. If we were on a platoon size operation. This is a particularly dangerous job as it requires that the point man go first and check out everything as we go. It also included helping the clumsy patrol leader across the small log bridges the Vietnamese use across the small canals. It requires that the point man check out hootches and bunkers, recover sampans and a host of other things that scared me to death, but Gordon was always not only willing but eager to do.

I think the most impressive thing about him is his sense of responsibility. I had about five other kids in the platoon that were about the same age as Gordon, but they had never learned to do a job correctly without someone looking over their shoulder

constantly. What's worse, they don't seem to particularly care if they do it right or not. I think that his having all these various jobs that always used to amaze me, played a large part in his performance with this platoon. However, I think the real reason for his attitude is his parents. I might not be in a position to pass judgment on parents, but I think that I am as I see these kids and how they react in every situation from good times to fighting and dying, and if that doesn't bring out the best and the worst—I don't know what is going to. I may be old fashioned, but I believe that a man is made by his parents and UDT training and SEAL training is not going to make the kind of guy that Gordon is out of someone who had been coddled and babied by his parents. These kind of people do get through training, but they are really not much more than physically tough—but mentally and morally babies. A lot of them go through training just to prove to themselves that they can do it since they have never been given a chance to prove themselves any other way. Since they never have proven themselves any way but physically, and since they don't know any better, they think that all they have to do is fifty push-ups every day and they are doing their job.

Gordon is the kind of guy with a wide range of experience and well-developed responsibility that we really need, and I would trade two or three of the guys that didn't get hit for him if we could get him back.

Since this is Christmas I will wish you a very Merry belated Christmas and Happy New Year. It is probably pretty nice for you to have your son back even if he is a bit perforated, and has a bunch of tubes sticking out. I will try and get a letter off to him here shortly, but if I don't, please give him my best and tell him that the rest of the platoon (what's left of it, I now have seven of the original 14) also send their regards. Also tell him that since he has left, we have no one to fix the jeep.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 53d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Events have caused much indescribable misery and suffering to innocent and helpless peoples, especially in Europe. Tens of millions of peoples have been victimized there and robbed of their freedom. The Lithuanian people are a prime example of such victimization.

These gallant and gifted people had regained their independence at the end of the First World War, and had rebuilt their country as a safe haven for themselves. But they were not allowed to enjoy their richly deserved freedom very long. After proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918, they lived in their newly constituted state for about 2 decades. Then the outbreak of the last war ushered in sad and tragic days for them. The government of the Soviet Union robbed the Lithuanian people of their freedom, put an end to their independence, and annexed the country to the Soviet Union in August of 1940.

At the end of the last war the Lithuanians had hoped for their delivery from Communist totalitarian tyranny, but

their hopes were shattered when instead of regaining their freedom, they fell victims to the Soviet Union's tyranny, which became firmly established in the country. Since then these helpless people have been prisoners in their homeland behind the Soviet imposed Iron Curtain.

Suffering under the oppressive and almost unbearable Communist totalitarian regime, they pray for their delivery. On the 53d anniversary of their Independence Day we echo their patriotic sentiments and hope for their deliverance from Communist control.

RARICK REPORTS ON NEED TO RETURN POWER TO THE PEOPLE OVER THEIR LOCAL SCHOOLS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to the people of my district, explaining to them the need for returning power to the people at the local level to control and conduct their public schools. I submit the following report:

POWER TO THE PEOPLE OVER THEIR LOCAL SCHOOLS

I'm John Rarick, your Representative with another report to you from your nation's capital.

Systems of tax supported, locally controlled public schools available to all of our youth have played a major role in making the United States the greatest and freest country in the world.

During the past few weeks, numerous instances have come to light both in and out of the South which offer additional proof that federal control of local education is providing to be a failure and a detriment to education. The HEW—federal court imposed plans for a racial mixing of students and teachers according to a fixed percentage is meeting with widespread resistance and resentment.

Here in the nation's capital, the Superintendent of Schools was recently reported in the local press to have said that Washington's schools are in a state of anarchy and that it would take more than a few years to really improve them. Already there are 40 policemen stationed in District schools to protect students, teachers, and property, and D.C. officials are asking for more police to be stationed in secondary schools following renewed robberies and shooting incidents.

In his State of the Union Message, in which he outlined his New American Revolution, President Nixon said:

"People came to America because they wanted to determine their own future rather than live in a country where others determined their future for them . . .

"Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives."

Nationwide there is a groundswell for less federal government control and for people at the local level to decide for themselves "those questions that so greatly affect their lives."

The issue is not between integration and segregation since schools racially mixed several years ago although many since have re-segregated as our people use their freedom of choice. The great majority of the

people want everyone, not just a few, to have the same rights—freedom of choice.

Freedom of choice is presently the law of the land. For if we do not have freedom, this is no longer the United States. The 1964 Civil Rights Act calls for a halt to discrimination, but it also states that there will be no forced busing or forced integration to obtain racial balance in schools. Under freedom of choice, parents were permitted to choose the school their children would attend. However, parents, both white and black, did not choose to suit the arbitrary whims of the HEW bureaucrats and federal judges. So, the latter—representing the executive and judicial branches of government, remade the law in an effort to achieve their predetermined goal—in each school there must be a certain percentage of black and white students and a fixed percentage of black and white teachers. This was to be attained even if it required busing. Education be hanged!

The only question now seems to be how much longer are the taxpayers and parents going to stand by and let a small group of unelected bureaucrats destroy our society by burdening the taxpayers with tremendous sums to force race mixing not only in our educational, but in our social and penal institutions as well, especially when both races can see that it is failing and widening the gap between the races. If this is social justice, what is tyranny?

Our basic law, the U.S. Constitution, was drafted when the sovereign States united to form this great nation. They made a contract—the U.S. Constitution—and created the federal government. In this contract, the States delegated only limited and specified powers to the federal government. The control of local schools was never one of those powers.

What will it take to make our federal judges and our President realize that the Constitution as written was intended to perpetuate people power? Or is it the power of the people that these bureaucratic demagogues fear?

When the executive or judicial branch violates the Constitution, then it is up to the States or the Congress to repair the damage and restore Constitutional government. The Congress has a duty to rectify the abhorrent conditions existing in the nation's schools by restoring control of local schools to the sovereign States and more especially to local school boards.

In keeping with my oath to represent you the constituents within the confines of defending and preserving the Constitution, I have proposed numerous pieces of legislation. One bill, H.R. 374, would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge. It would confer on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secure to children the right to attend the public schools their parents choose, and make effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in schools in which they contract to serve.

To put teeth in my proposed law, I have made provision for a school board or the parent of a student affected by a violation or threatened violation by any department, agency or officer of the United States to bring suit for redress against the United States in District Court.

My bill, H.R. 374, would also restrain federal judges from ordering school boards to comply with illegal and arbitrary regulations of HEW officials in their plans and guidelines to control local schools. The bill provides that "no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to make any decision, enter any judgment, or issue any order requiring any school board to make any change in

racial composition of the student body at any public school or in any class at any public school to which students are assigned in conformity with a freedom of choice system."

The bill would prohibit federal judges from requiring any school board to transport students from one public school to another merely in order to effect a change in the racial composition of the student body. It would forbid federal judges precluding a school board from carrying into effect any provision of a contract with a faculty member specifying the public school where the member of the faculty is to perform his or her duties under a contract.

This bill, if enacted into law, will be one sure way to save public education by rescuing our besieged public schools from the federal mess and deepening morass into which they have fallen. I admit that I do not have all the answers, but I know full well our present course can only lead to more destruction, chaos and denial of quality education.

The alternatives are education and community peace—or conflict, violence and worsening of community relations.

CITIZEN-CHAIRMAN EARL WARREN BACK IN LABOR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Citizen-Chairman Earl Warren of the United Nations Association, probably best known for his international accomplishments toward destroying constitutional government and public education in our Nation, is back laboring in circles—international circles, that is.

Citizen-Chairman Warren's latest international achievement is his nomination to serve on a committee of the International Labor Organization, the ILO, a spur of the discredited UNO one world body. Supposedly, Citizen-Chairman Warren's new labors will require him to supervise guideline compliance over members of the UNO on international social and human rights standards laid down by the ILO.

Woe unto the workers of the world. Yet, American labor may still survive if only Citizen-Chairman Warren is as successful in using his position to progress the world to chaos, violence, and bankruptcy as he was with the United States. Quite a setback for Chairman Warren who was promised chief justice of the world but then he can find the U.N. Charter repugnant with ILO guidelines.

Citizen of the world, Chairman Warren, being the best Republican catch for the ILO, should indicate to the American people how hard up the UNO is to put another "yes" man on the international payroll. Things must be moving poorly on the international front.

I include a newsclipping, as follows:

[The Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1971]

EARL WARREN NAMED TO ILO COMMITTEE

UNITED NATIONS.—Earl Warren, former chief justice of the United States, has been nominated to serve on a committee of the International Labor Organization, it was announced yesterday.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wilfred Jenks, ILO director general, nominated Warren to the 19-member committee on application of conventions and recommendations which meets each year to examine reports from governments on implementation of the international social and human rights standards drawn up by the ILO.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, this month marks two important but too little known dates: The 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State and the 53d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

In an era distinguished by the emergence of newly independent nations, it is a cruel irony that a country with such a long tradition of freedom cannot observe what should be a memorable occasion.

Since June of 1940, after the subjugation of Poland, Lithuania has been subjected to Soviet domination.

Foreign intervention is not new to Lithuania. Situated in a particularly vulnerable position on the Baltic Sea, the country has long known threats from the Teutonic peoples on the west and Russia on the east. But the current oppression has been the most severe.

The conquest was not an easy one. Lithuanians fought fiercely to maintain their independence, and, as a result, many were exiled to labor camps in Siberia. And retaliatory measures did not end there: During the last three decades Lithuania has lost more than one-fourth of her population through the continued Soviet program for deportation and resettlement.

The resistance realized one brief victory in June of 1941 when a free provisional government remained in existence for 6 weeks, only to yield to Nazi domination. Although active resistance ceased in 1952, resistance by passive means has gained a new impetus.

The hijacking of a Russian airliner, and an incident more prominent in the minds of Americans, the defection attempt of Simas Kudirka, vividly illustrate the persistence of the Lithuanian desire for freedom.

The United States recognizes the true attitude of the Lithuanian people by maintaining diplomatic relations with the former free government. It has been the firm and consistent policy of the U.S. Government to support the aspirations of the Baltic people for self-determination and the right to pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development freely.

In view of our own cherished tradition of liberty and of the many historical, cultural, and familial ties existing between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people, it is entirely appropriate that we in Congress take this occasion to focus the attention of the

February 26, 1971

United Nations, other international forums, and free people everywhere on this unjust denial of the right of self-determination, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on the restoration of these fundamental human rights to the Baltic peoples.

MILITARY JUSTIFIABLE AND POLITICALLY ACCEPTANCE

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, Defense Department spokesmen have recently stated that we have been flying between 12,000 and 14,000 air sorties in Southeast Asia, at least half of which are over the countries of Laos and Cambodia.

To get some idea of the devastation that one such sortie can cause, we are indebted to Life correspondent John Sarr, whose comments were reported in Life of February 19, 1971, together with an editorial concluding that:

... on the whole, we think the actions taken thus far by the Administration and the South Vietnamese in Laos are militarily justifiable and politically acceptable.

Interestingly enough, Life's cover and a feature article described the "Wave of Nostalgia" now sweeping our affluent and peaceful country at the same time that the Congress and our people were silently acquiescing in the "unlimited aerial warfare" proclaimed by President Richard Nixon on February 16, and the massive bombardment which is claiming the lives and homes of so many Laotian and Cambodian peasants.

To understand how many such lives and homes are being destroyed by 12,000 to 14,000 sorties a month, consider the following account of one bombing run by one American warplane, and following such account, consider the words of the New York Times' Tom Wicker on February 21, 1971:

THE EDGE OF LAOS

(By John Saar)

Late afternoon, 6 February 1971. I first hear the distant whistle of a plane as Larry Burrows and I stand chatting at the roadside headquarters of Task Force 11 just three kilometers from the Laos border. Tomorrow, or maybe the day after, this amalgam of elite South Vietnamese army units will pull its armored track carriers back on to dusty Route 9 and head into Laos. We plan to ride with them.

The U.S. advisers are relaxed and pleasant and Task Force 11's commander, Lt. Colonel Bul Dung, returns our greeting with a warm smile. Everyone knows that across the border in Laos there will be hard battles, but today the mood is light-hearted, almost festive. Chattering and joking, the paratroopers are settling in, gouging out slit trenches, stringing tents. Rice savored with onions and vegetables bubbles over dozens of fires, scalding tea in blue-and-white china bowls passes delicately from one hand to the next.

Like a horn on New York's Fifth Avenue, the rising whine of a jet fighter is simply a background noise in Vietnam. I hear it, think "jet on a strike run" and ignore it.

Why not? Every so often someone will say, "Hey, look at that jet roll out," and you watch—detached, safe, vaguely sympathetic to the recipients of the ton of high explosive or tanks of napalm. To the allied armies and the press who travel with them, our air power is as innocuous and reliable as home electricity. Only this time the jet was rolling in on us.

In the fading light the diving plane is hardly visible. But two men, a Vietnamese officer and his American adviser, see it, and the three bombs tumbling toward them. They go headlong into a trench. Alabama-born Staff Sergeant Bob Logan later spoke of it as "high-diving without a pool."

Burrows is talking about film shipments. Two bangs snatch my attention—close, but safe. Then explosions are on us, in us, among us. The world is one terrible *kkerrush* of sound and blast—and the brain lurches with the impact. For a frozen microsecond I read incredulity and horror on the faces around me, then we are all down and scrabbling for cover.

A shallow cooking trench. Two big fires, two simmering pots inches away. Christ, I'm going to roast to death. But my head is saying, don't move, mortars, mortars, another salvo any moment. I carry that helmet everywhere, where is it? I look around. One man is moving—fast, decisive—toward the impact area: Larry Burrows. In a thought vacuum I follow. The sunset is still pale gold on the mountaintops. Now there is a stronger, wicked yellow: flames are licking from the turret of a burning tank. We run on and Burrows goes prone to frame the scene. We are the first ones here, and the brain can't accept the visual evidence as real. People bleeding, tattered, broken people strewn everywhere by the steel cyclone. Nightmarishly outlined in the half light, dust-gray apparitions already showing ominously dark, spreading blotches rise to an elbow and extend a pleading arm. From all sides comes the elemental moan of men beseeching help.

Pandemonium. Two officers are already on the radio, calling for Medevac helicopters, but most are momentarily shocked into inactivity. And pandemonium in my head. Again it is Burrows who gives me the lead. "Come and help me bring that chap in," he says. No stretchers. Awkwardly, we pick him up by legs and arms. God, this is not only macabre, it's difficult and tiring as well. We stumble across the broken ground. My hands are slick with the man's blood and I feel its seeping wetness in my clothes. He is hard hit to the chest and stomach, now I know he must be hit in the head as well. From the depths of him comes a groan of unspeakable pain. It wrings from Burrows an answering groan of commiseration.

We bring in two more badly wounded and lay them at the edge of a bomb crater where a dressing station is hubbubbing into action. Excited voices gabbling into radios, figures blundering into one another. A wide-eyed medic arrives running barefoot with a "panic bag" in hand. A roar of exploding ammunition from a burning armored personnel carrier adds to the confusion.

Now the wounded are coming in thick and fast, very few walking. The talk is not of NVA rockets or motars but of something called CBU dropped accidentally by a friendly plane. These cluster bomb units leave the plane as a single bomb, then explode apart into numbers of oval grenades, which in turn explode individually to create a blizzard of steel. If one plane on one run can inflict such savage hurt, I think, what unimaginable suffering has been inflicted by thousands of planes on thousands of runs?

For perhaps 10 minutes Task Force 11 has been overwhelmed by shock. Now paralysis passes and the pressure of emergency reveals personality. Most assertive is Major Todd, Georgian, senior adviser to the paratroops, who bellows orders in a mixture of pidgin

English and bastard French which reduces everything to stark essentials. When the first helicopter is coming in, we hear him yell, "Only the man. No stretchers. 'Cause so beaucoup many."

Major Bill Aiken, senior adviser to the cavalry squadron, is on his second tour, but he has seen nothing like this. He sits, head sunk, shoulders hunched, and when one of his team tells him that "So-and-so is badly shaken up," Aiken replies, "He ain't the only one." But later, when there is work to do, he is on hand.

In his command center, neat in a long greatcoat, Colonel Dung coordinates the recovery of the wounded and alerts his outer defenses. He is outwardly calm, but his emotions are suppressed, not absent, and in the morning he allows himself a single telling comment: "It is sad to lose men in this way."

One of two wounded officers is paratrooper Major Nguyen Son Ha. A chirpy man of exquisite manners and delightfully deplorable English, he declines to be Medevaced until 12 hours later. By that time his broken arm is grossly swollen and his face is blanched with pain.

After 30 minutes the wounded are still coming in. Among the last is a man with a broken leg who staggers in unaided. How many are there? Thirty, forty, Christ, at least fifty. Two medics were killed outright and even at full strength there is no way the aid teams could cope with these numbers. As I watch, it becomes plain that the two doctors have been forced to leave some of the worst casualties untended in order to save those with a better chance. Two of the men Burrows and I brought in are dying where we left them. Some of the bandaging has been too hasty. One man squelches in a pool of his own blood as he rocks to and fro with pain. Three medics come over and replace the blood-soaked field dressings. The man is still contorted with pain and rams his head into the side of a corpse alongside.

The moon glides from behind clouds and lights the small slope. It is littered with wounded, blood stains showing starkly against the gleaming white bandages. The medics and the other unwounded figures who scurry about are impossible to distinguish as American or Vietnamese. One man, whose left leg is nothing but bone and shredded flesh, raises his head to see while the medics are scissoring away the cloth. He sees and falls back soundlessly. The thought of what he sees chills me inside. Another man lying on the ground in the crucifix position moves inch by inch to the man next to him. He gropes for the man's hand and clasps it tight. The wounded are talking to one another. I can't imagine, nor do I want to know, what they say.

The Vietnamese follow the Chinese philosophy: pain must be borne with minimum display, and to a Westerner the stoicism is awesome. Men in terrible fear and pain are murmuring for the aid of their Creator and whimpering gently. I yearn for someone to scream so that I too may cry. No one does. But there is no unobtrusive exit for men who are 20 years old and want to live. They fight for breath until you long for them to die. Chest heaving with the effort, one man emits a rasping, almost metallic rattle as he sucks air through a blood-filled throat. At last he dies, chest expanded, as though that last effort stopped his heart. The man whose blood stained my trousers is also dead. One of the two doctors working with frenzied speed is 29-year-old Dr. Phan Van Chuong, who joined the army only six weeks ago. He is appalled by the number and severity of the casualties. In the morning, close to tears, he will say, "It was impossible, impossible."

The first American Medevac helicopter circles cautiously down through the cloud cover and clacks in to land, then pulls away.

"What's the problem?"

"He can't see to land." Route 9 is ankle-

deep in dust, and the blades throw up a cloud which drowns the bright landing light. "Throw water to damp the dust."

The helicopter lands and there is another obscene drama half-seen through the dust. There are too many casualties, no place for stretchers. Little groups of half-real, half-glimpsed figures run out with the worst wounded in their arms. The blinking red lights on the chopper glow eerily on their helmets and seem to pulse. Hurry, Hurry, Hurry. Forced to treat their comrades like so many carcasses, the paratroops shove wounded on top of one another until the cabin is a surreal slaughterhouse. Then the chopper sets off on its dangerous return flight.

The airlift goes on for three hours. The accidental bombing by an American aircraft, probably Navy, cost seven dead and 54 wounded. Several of the wounded were expected to die. But slowly Task Force 11 recovers its confidence, turns its face away from the grave of personal calamity and back to the war. After two hours the first quiet laugh is heard. Clunking shovels heap fresh soil on the blood-stained ground, the dead are packaged in ponchos, tied with bandages packs and weapons of the missing men are heaped for removal. An American voice suggests that the helicopter pilots should be called in to back-haul the bodies tonight without being told they are running risks for the dead. Fortunately, Major Todd will have none of that nonsense. The bodies stay. Before they are taken away in the morning, a Vietnamese trooper looks for, finds and removes a pair of boots which are apparently his size.

But now there are still more wounded to move.

"How many to go?" a paratrooper asks.

"Three, I think." And then to me, "Is that one dead?"

I stoop over a man whose face is shrouded from the dust by a towel. My hand is on his chest and I feel a slight movement. "No, he's alive."

"Okay, make it four."

A SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's news conference of Feb. 17 made clear what skeptics have long believed. His Vietnam policy is by no means one of steadily withdrawing Americans from South Vietnam, then letting the people of Indochina work out or fight out their own affairs. It is instead a policy of escalation by American air power and South Vietnamese manpower, with the aim of military victory.

"I am not going to place any limitations upon the use of air power," Mr. Nixon said, excepting only the use of nuclear weapons. And if South Vietnam invades North Vietnam across the demilitarized zone—"to defend their national security," in the President's Orwellian lingo—Mr. Nixon openly left standing the possibility of sending American air power to support the invasion.

Mr. Nixon was careful at every turn to lay down, as a basis for an unlimited air war, the doctrine that he would be acting only to protect the lives of American ground troops. This blatant deception was used to justify the Cambodian invasion and is being used to justify the current extension of the ground war into the Laotian panhandle. But it was exposed as a fraud by Mr. Nixon himself, who claimed that the fighting in Cambodia had cut one North Vietnamese "lifeline" and then said of the march into Laos:

"This action would either cut or seriously disrupt the other pipeline or lifeline . . . the Ho Chi Minh Trail into the north half of South Vietnam. Therefore, we expected the North Vietnamese to fight here. They have to fight here or give up the struggle to conquer South Vietnam, Cambodia, and their

influence extending through other parts of Southeast Asia."

Those are the words of a man seeking a showdown. The clear threat to turn loose the South Vietnamese to invade North Vietnam, under a protective umbrella of American planes and behind a destructive barrage of American bombs, may be in part psychological warfare. But if the President cannot get his victory in Laos, as he could not get it in South Vietnam or in Cambodia, there is only one other place to seek it, and every reason to believe that Mr. Nixon will do just that.

It should be noted well that this President, who was elected promising to end—not win—the war, has effectively jettisoned the Paris negotiations. Not only did he say that American representatives would continue to participate only in hopes of making an arrangement concerning prisoners of war—not the war itself—but he also said flatly that "we are not going to make any more concessions."

Not content with this demolition, Mr. Nixon went further and reiterated the fact that he has also abrogated the only fruitful results of those talks—the October, 1968 "understanding" by which the bombing of North Vietnam was ended.

That understanding was entered in good faith by the previous Administration and by Hanoi. Now Mr. Nixon has asserted without convincing supporting evidence that attacks on American reconnaissance planes over Hanoi constitute a North Vietnamese violation of the understanding that releases him from it; further, Mr. Nixon insists that he will bomb North Vietnam any time he decides anything happening in that country threatens American lives.

So the talks are dead, interred by a President who charges the other side with making no concessions despite having made none himself on any point that matters; and the important understanding those talks produced is also dead, broken by the second American President who failed to honor an arrangement with Hanoi; and the war has been carried by air and invasion to two more countries, with the threat poised of the invasion and aerial devastation of a third.

This is a policy calculated to bludgeon North Vietnam to its knees, without appalling American casualty lists; it is also a policy that risks retaliation elsewhere—in northern Laos or in Thailand—and might bring Chinese entry into the war. But above all, every American, every citizen who loves his country, every man who honors humanity should understand the cost of this policy in life and suffering.

It is a policy of indiscriminate aerial warfare and blind firepower on the ground that means death and destruction wholesale, not just body counts of enemy dead, but a slaughter of innocents—women and children and old people—villages destroyed, the earth ravaged, refugees in their miserable thousands wandering homeless and hungry. For the people of Indochina, it is a wanton lie that this Administration is "winding down" the war; it is spreading the war like a holocaust.

In a forthcoming article in *The New York Review of Books*, Daniel Ellsberg cites Senate reports showing that more than a million Cambodian refugees have been "generated" in the last nine months; that in Mr. Nixon's first year in office about 50,000 civilians were killed, and in his second, more than 70,000. No one knows how many there will be in his third, or what number of innocents will die in Laos, or how many more will be made refugees.

But they will be many, and every one an ineradicable stain upon the once-proud name of the United States of America.

REVENUE-SHARING IMPLICATIONS: A REPLY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, February 25, contains a very interesting article by Christopher Demuth entitled "Revenue-Sharing Implications: A Reply." Under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this article and recommend it to my colleagues' attention as part of our continuing dialog on the pros and cons of revenue sharing:

REVENUE-SHARING IMPLICATIONS: A REPLY (By Christopher Demuth)

Monroe Karmin's analysis of "The Politics of Nixon's 'Revolution'" (Feb. 11) suggests that the objective of the President's revenue sharing proposal is to shift government attention and largess away from the big central cities, and particularly the poor and black communities within them, and toward the suburban and rural areas where "Nixon people" are found. There is a certain political logic to this, if one is willing to believe that Presidents are strongly motivated by considerations of patronage. But I think it is mostly wrong, and distracts from the more important issues that revenue sharing presents.

Whatever may be the merits of concentrating federal resources on rural areas, revenue sharing is an unlikely vehicle for the task. The existing system of categorical grants-in-aid does redistribute tax money from the wealthier urban states to the less prosperous rural ones. For example, in 1968 New York received from the federal government \$313 per capita less than it had paid in income taxes, while North Dakota received \$180 per capita more than it had paid. Revenue sharing would distribute funds according to population and local tax effort, and reduce this redistributive effect greatly. The urban industrial states would get back a much larger share of their federal payments. Governors Rockefeller and Ogilvie did not get where they are championing causes that lose them money.

A LESS THAN FAIR MEASURE

Even the most urban states are really more suburban and rural than urban. And, says Mr. Karmin, regardless of how much revenue sharing is earmarked for the hard-pressed big cities in these states, their claim on federal funds "seems likely to be sharply restricted." Compared to what? A domestic "Marshall Plan"? It seems less than fair to measure the President's performance against the campaign slogans of the man he defeated. Had Mr. Humphrey been elected would we have an urban "Marshall Plan" today? Assuming that he took his campaign slogan seriously, he would first have had to figure out what it meant—different from, say, urban renewal (under which even modest programs now take over ten years to complete, and which frequently has difficulty spending all the money appropriated to it) or Model Cities (which was once touted as something of a "Marshall Plan" itself). Then he would have had to steer the program through Congress, which would have meant, if the Model Cities experience is any guide, "Marshall Plans" not only for the big cities but for many very small ones as well (at least as many as there are Senators and Congressmen on the appropriations committees). Then he would have had to find the money to pay for the "Plans," and he almost

certainly would have ended up taking more money out of the big cities than he would have eventually turned back to them.

My point is that it is mere speculation to say that a Democratic administration would have spent more on the cities or on the poor.

Federal spending on urban social programs is higher today than it ever has been, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the federal budget. If the President's revenue sharing and welfare reform proposals are adopted it will be much higher still. No doubt many would like it to be even higher (I am one), especially those who are not inconvenienced with the responsibility of preparing the federal budget. Many will want more under any circumstances. Our desires will always outstrip our means.

The importance of revenue sharing is not in the amount of money it would give out or even in the apportionment among the several layers of government. The important point is that it changes the rules of the game, eliminating massive federal regulation and giving state and local officials far greater say over how federal funds are spent within their domains.

Mr. Karmin states that the President would like to do this "on the theory that they know best how to solve their problems." The theory, I think, is that such officials are elected by voters rather than hired by the Civil Service Commission. They are subject to certain disciplines and obligations that federal employees may freely ignore, for example, the need to reconcile the competing interests of diverse groups of citizens and the need to meet payrolls. Being politicians they must follow not only their private instincts and attitudes but those of the public as well; being executives they must not only promise but perform. But under the present system of narrow categorical grants, with dozens of federal strings tied to every dollar, these officials have been reduced to wards of the federal agencies, scurrying to and from Washington, tailoring their budgets to meet the available programs, drafting scores of applications and reports for the satisfaction of federal civil servants. This is why no one things it odd or disingenuous when a big city mayor seeks to blame all of his troubles on Washington. The central purpose of revenue sharing is to free these officials, to give them the capacity and the responsibility to accomplish themselves the difficult tasks for which the voters elected them.

But, Mr. Karmin notes, the effect of removing those federal strings will likely be to "dilute" the funds that are now focused on the central cities. Good management and good political science, perhaps, but a bad deal for the poor. Other writers have made a similar but much harsher point: state and local governments, they say, are dominated by racists, reactionaries and even Republicans, who are bound to turn their backs on the poor once the federal agencies loosen their grip. What're Sam Yorty and George Wallace going to do with all that cash, anyway?

DISREGARDING THE OBVIOUS

The latter argument (not Mr. Karmin's) shows a remarkable ability to disregard the obvious, especially coming as it so often does from mid-town Manhattan. The mayors of our large cities are, on the whole, the most progressive-minded public officials in American politics, certainly far more "liberal" than their respective congressional delegations. In this they are followed closely by the nation's governors, again taken as a group. Surely these men can be trusted to look out for the interests of the poor and the interest of minorities with at least as much energy and commitment as any others in American government. If, as Mr. Karmin anticipates, revenue sharing funds are more "universalized" and less focused on the physical con-

lines of the poorest neighborhoods, that is not necessarily against the interest of the poor or the cities. The notion of "targeting" funds on discrete neighborhoods was central to the original operation of the Model Cities program, and before long it was precisely this feature that governors, mayors and Model Cities directors alike were imploring Washington to change. And is there a big city mayor who thinks his city's most serious social problems can be solved wholly within the city limits?

Of course each of us can think of state and local politicians whom we would hardly trust to take to heart the interests of the poor or anyone else: they may have obnoxious political views, may be corrupt, or may simply be incompetent. Such men are mercifully few, but what of them?

If they are men of extreme political views, it must be admitted that they represent public resentments that cannot be ignored. It seems likely that we are destined now for a full generation of fairly high and constant social friction. In such times James Madison's famous maxim, that federalism is the best protection against the formation of national factions, holds with especial force. The Max Rafferties of American politics (read in your favorite political villain, right or left) are bound to have their day: far better at the local level than nationally. They will find government far more ambiguous and complicated than they had imagined. They will have to learn to negotiate and compromise just like the rest of us, or be swiftly retired back to private life. (It should be noted here that federal civil rights laws will apply fully to all revenue sharing funds.)

If they are corrupt, it is noteworthy that it is in state and local governments that opportunities for corruption abound. And this is in large part because these governments are heavily dependent on taxing schemes—taxes on real estate values and race tracks, for example—which vest in relatively obscure officials an altogether unhealthy degree of discretion over private economic activities. Revenue sharing (federally audited) will reduce this dependence and increase the use of automatic, corruption-proof taxes.

A SOLUTION FOR INCOMPETENCE

If they are simply incompetent, obviously the only solution is for more competent people to become involved in state and local governments. Today the brightest men and women seek federal office, or at least federal employment, because that is where the opportunities are for leadership and achievement. State and local governments will not attract large numbers of these people until they offer equal challenges.

The wonder is that, under present arrangements, so many able people go into local government at all. When John F. Kennedy was an ambitious young Congressman planning his political career, he avoided running for governor of Massachusetts because he didn't want to be "handing out sewer contracts." Sewer contracts have become much more fashionable since then, as concern over pollution has mounted. And as concern over a host of other, more difficult, urban problems has mounted, so has the importance of other governmental tasks that once were considered mundane and lacking in glamor. Revenue sharing would go a long way toward seeing that they are performed wisely and well.

A TRIBUTE TO MIYAZO FUJIZAWA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, often these days, our concerns

center upon the youth of America, but today I rise to pay tribute to one of the wise elder citizens of Gardena, a community which lies within the congressional district I represent.

Miyazo Fujizawa will enter his 100th year today, having been born in Hara Mura Aza, Kamiishi, Yamagata Gun, Hiroshima Prefecture, Japan, on February 25, 1872. He was the third son born to his parents, Itaro and Kiku Fujiura.

Mr. Fujizawa left his native land before the turn of the century, immigrating to the United States via Vancouver, Canada, in 1896. By February 1897, he had begun working in the orange groves around Riverside, Calif.

Except for a brief period of employment by the Salton Sink Salt Co., Mr. Fujizawa devoted his life to agricultural pursuits because of his deep feeling for the land. Besides working in orange groves, he also grew melons in the Coachella Valley and later farmed and raised cattle in the Imperial Valley.

When he married Miss Rui Fujizawa in June 1912, he adopted her family name. In 1919, the Fujizawas returned to Japan for a 2-year visit before returning to their Imperial Valley farm.

Following the outbreak of World War II, he was interned in South Dakota and later transferred to Poston Relocation Center in Arizona from 1943 to 1945. In 1945, he resumed his active life of farming in Glendale, Ariz., for 2 years before retiring at the age of 75.

Mr. Fujizawa will be an especially honored guest on March 6 when the Gardena Buddhist Church will host a party honoring all of its members who are 80 or more years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House of Representatives to join me today in a hearty "happy birthday" wish for Mr. Fujizawa that this honored senior citizen will be able to serve and advise his church for many years to come.

CONTROLS ON FIREARMS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the third successive Congress legislation to require the registration and licensing of all firearms. I believe more firmly than ever that it is absolutely necessary if we are to come to grips with the rising tide of violence and the alarming increase in use of deadly weapons in our country.

The statistics speak for themselves. Since 1900 guns have killed over 800,000 persons in America. More than 20,000 people are shot to death and upwards of 200,000 are injured or maimed by firearms each year.

Total casualties from civilian gunfire in this century exceed our military casualties in all the wars from the Revolution through the Vietnam war. In 1969 and 1970, more people were murdered by guns in the United States than were killed on the battlefields of Indochina.

And still the unlicensed sale of firearms continues to jump dramatically.

Rifle sales between 1961 and 1967 increased 115 percent to 1,882,000 annually. In the same period, shotgun sales increased 151 percent to 1,515,000, and pistol sales were up 139 percent to 1,188,000. By 1967, total firearms sales were 4,585,000 annually and still rising.

Present estimates of the number of firearms in private ownership range from 50 million to 200 million, with over 40 million people owning guns.

We have made America an armed camp and we are paying a dear price for it.

In 1968 alone, 8,900 murders, 12,000 suicides, 65,000 assaults, and 99,000 robberies were all committed with firearms. Unfortunately, these statistics are simply part of a continuing pattern. Thus, between 1964 and 1969, robberies with guns increased 113 percent and assaults with guns 117 percent.

The connection between guns and violence is well documented. J. Edgar Hoover has said:

Those who claim that the availability of firearms is not a factor in murders in this country are not facing reality.

Yet we remain the only civilized Nation in the world which has not acted to control guns. Japan, with one-half our population, had 16 murders and 68 suicides by gunfire in 1966 compared to 6,855 murders and 10,407 suicides by gunfire in the United States in the same year. Canada had 98 gun murders among 19,604,000 people in 1966, one-seventh the rate of the United States. England and Wales had 27 murders with guns in 1966 among 54½ million people, while Houston, Tex., alone had 150 gun murders among its 1½ million citizens.

Even our limited experience with gun control in the United States reveals that murder and other crimes committed with guns occur more frequently where guns are most plentiful and gun control laws least stringent; and the overall murder rate is higher, too.

In the face of such overwhelming evidence, how much longer are we going to permit the slaughter to go on? Can we survive another generation like the last one, where gunfire cost us such valued leaders as John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Medgar Evers, and Malcolm X?

My answer is no and that is why I am introducing this legislation to require the registration and licensing of all firearms. Specifically, it would require the national registration of virtually every gun in America. Computer technology has made it possible to feed into a computer bank at the National Crime Information Center the name and address and other pertinent information with respect to the owner of a firearm: The manufacturer, caliber and gauge, model and serial number of the gun: The date, place, and the name and address of the person from whom the firearm was obtained. In this respect, it is important to remember that Sirhan Sirhan was identified from leads supplied in seconds by a State computer in Sacramento which recorded the name of the prior owner and identification of the pistol used to murder Robert Kennedy.

The bill also provides a 180-day grace period from the time of enactment, dur-

ing which gun owners must register their weapons with the Department of the Treasury. Thereafter, possession of an unregistered gun shall result in punishment by fine or imprisonment.

The bill also establishes minimum standards to be followed by States and their political subdivisions in establishing a permit system for the possession of firearms. An adequate permit system must include identification of the permit holder, including name, address, age, and signature or photograph; denial of permits to persons under indictment or who have been convicted of a felony or to persons who by reason of age, mental condition, alcoholism, or drug addiction cannot be relied upon to possess or use firearms safely and responsibly.

The power to prevent crimes with guns where permits are required is very real. Police know and favor strong licensing laws. A man carrying a gun can be charged with illegal possession if he has no permit. Since crime repeaters known to police cannot qualify for a permit, they can be arrested if found with a gun in their possession. This is a very practical and effective deterrent.

Finally, the bill provides that initiative for licensing would rest with the States but Federal licensing provisions would go into effect in any State failing to meet the minimum Federal standards.

I know that many people will still raise objections to gun control despite the clear connection to violence. Therefore, I would just like to take a minute to discuss some of the arguments most frequently raised. First, it is often argued that the Constitution prohibits the registration or licensing of firearms. Such an argument ignores both history and law. The second amendment provides—

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

The purpose, as its language clearly states, was to insure to the States the right to maintain an armed militia. It has nothing to do with individual ownership and possession of guns and the courts have so held repeatedly.

Second, it is often argued that possession of a gun can protect a private individual against crime. Perhaps the most lucid answer to this contention can be found in Ramsey Clark's recent book, "Crime in America." He says:

A state in which a citizen needs a gun to defend himself from crime has failed to perform its first purpose. There is anarchy, not order under law—a jungle where each relies on himself for survival. The wrong people survive, because the calculating killer or the uninhibited psychotic more often wields the faster gun. The average citizen with a gun acting in self-defense—housewife, bus driver, liquor store clerk—is a greater danger to himself and innocent people in the vicinity than is the crime he would prevent. There are bodies of good people in cemeteries all over the nation which evidence this fact.

Third, it is argued that people, not guns, kill. This bit of sophistry neglects to account for the deadliness of guns and human nature. If you wished to rob Fort Knox, you might hesitate if you only had a knife. If you were ready to do battle with a person who outweighed you

by 100 pounds, you also might hesitate if you did not have a gun. Guns are the great equalizer; they embolden a person. And that is not surprising when you stop to consider that one person in five who is assaulted with a gun dies, compared to one in 20 where a knife is a weapon.

Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that murder is usually a crime of passion and so not controllable by normal police action. As J. Edgar Hoover stated in the FBI's 1969 Uniform Crime Reports:

Police are powerless to prevent a large number of these crimes (murders), which is made readily apparent from the circumstances or motives which surround criminal homicide. The significant fact emerges that most murders are committed by relatives of the victim or persons acquainted with the victim. It follows, therefore, that criminal homicide is, to a major extent, a national social problem beyond police prevention.

Thus, the tragedy is that a rifle was in the closet when a son—just for a moment—was so angry he wanted to kill his father, or a pistol was in the night table when the husband became enraged during a drunken argument with his wife.

Finally, it is argued that it is a nuisance to license a gun. Yet, we register everything from cars and dogs to marriages and wills. Is it too much to ask us to register our guns?

The uniform experience in nations and States that have controlled guns has been a lower rate of crime committed with guns. If guns are not at hand, the criminal will not find them. If he does, his possession would be a crime and he could be arrested before he commits a more serious crime.

Mr. Speaker, firearms have taken far too many lives from us. If we are serious about controlling crime, it is essential that we move to control guns or else they will surely continue to control us.

LITHUANIA'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this last week was the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania. I wish to present the following statement regarding the plight of the thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians still behind the Iron Curtain, enslaved by communism:

LITHUANIA'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM—30 YEARS OF SOVIET OPPRESSION

For too long too many people throughout the world have been unaware of what happened to the people of Lithuania. The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of Lithuania shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded and occupied Lithuania in June of 1940, and the Lithuanian people have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for more than 30 years.

Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, numbering over 1,000,000 in the United States, and their friends in all parts of the

country will commemorate two very important anniversaries during the second part of February, 1971: (1) They will observe the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and (2) They will mark the 53rd anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. But this celebration of Lithuania's Independence Day will not be similar to American celebration of the Fourth of July. It will contain no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory. On the contrary, the observance will be somber, sorrowful, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania has lost its independence, and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

The Lithuanians are proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. Lithuania has suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West the country was invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Lithuanians, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians. Their language is the oldest in Europe today.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into Lithuania and annexed this republic in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under the Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic Siberia. The people of Lithuania have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, Lithuania has lost more than one-fourth of the country's population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet-Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanians have waged an intensive fight for freedom. This year marks the 30th anniversary of Lithuania's successful revolt against the Soviet Union. During the second part of June of 1941 the people of Lithuania succeeded in getting rid of the Communist regime in the country: freedom and independence were restored and a free government was re-established. This free, provisional government remained in existence for more than six weeks. At that time Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis who suppressed all the activities of this free government and the government itself. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, more than 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of Lithuania's resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The persecution of Solzhenitsyn, the clamp on Rostropovich and other dissenters in the Soviet Union received a great deal of publicity in the free world's press. Very well publicized were the Simas Kudirka—Coast Guard tragedy, the Hijacking of a Russian jet liner by Brazinskis and his son, death sentences imposed on two Jews and a young Lithuanian, Vytautas Simokaitis, for trying to escape the Communist tyranny. But this is only the tip of the iceberg or desperation in the Soviet empire. In slave labor camps in the Soviet Union millions of people are

still being held. Many dissenters are being confined to psychiatric institutions and being murdered by the Kremlin thugs. It is an established fact that a brilliant Lithuanian linguist, Dr. Jonas Kazlauskas, 40 years old, was murdered in a psychiatric hospital in Moscow three months ago. His only "crime" was that he had received an invitation to come to the University of Pennsylvania (in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) as a guest professor for this very spring semester of 1971.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Government of Lithuania. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of Lithuania by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering people of Lithuania to get rid of the Communist regime in their country.

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other captive nations whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

The United States Congress has made a right step into the right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic republics—Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is surely intolerable.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives
CXVII—264—Part 4

(the Senate concurring). That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the issue of health care will dominate the 92d Congress, and this is rightly so. Health services are severely inadequate. Their cost is unconscionable.

As a cosponsor of the Health Security Act of 1971, of which our colleagues Mrs. GRIFFITHS of Michigan and Mr. CORMAN of California are the principal sponsors in the House, and of which Senator KENNEDY is the principal sponsor in the Senate, I am particularly concerned that the public become fully involved in the debates concerning health care which will be occupying national attention in the forthcoming months.

I believe an excellent synopsis of the program proposed by the Health Security Act of 1971—H.R. 22 and H.R. 23—is provided by the February 19, 1971, statement of the AFL-CIO executive council on the health security program. As the statement says:

(G)enerally, all of the proposals, except National Health Security, lack at least one of the following: equal access to health care for all people; comprehensive coverage; restructuring of the health care system; effective incentives for quality and efficiency or controls on costs; or they depend on inadequate private insurance as carriers or intermediaries or both.

I include the full statement of the AFL-CIO executive council at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON HEALTH SECURITY PROGRAM

Health care problems in America are frightening—to the patient, who must pay ever larger portions of his family budget for medical care, and to the medical professional, who must try to care for the health of his patients hindered by an outmoded delivery system.

What America needs as the heart of its medical care philosophy is a single primary goal—good health for all its peoples. The profit-making philosophy of the market place—to make money for those who provide and finance medical services—is not an acceptable philosophy for medical care.

The AFL-CIO believes that the National Health Security Bill is the only truly comprehensive program of national health insurance that meets the challenges of care, financing, costs, development and reform. Indeed, the goal of Health Security is health.

CARE

America has the best available medical talent—but available to only part of the society.

Consider the plight of non-white Ameri-

cans who live in poverty in city ghettos and rural shacks: Their men and women can expect seven fewer years of life than more affluent Americans; their babies have as much chance of surviving as infants in Ecuador; their young mothers have about the same chance of surviving childbirth as the women of Costa Rica.

Health care is not equally provided for all Americans. It is a myth that private insurance is doing—or can do—the job. More than 20 percent of the population under 65 is not covered against the most costly aspects of medical care—hospital and surgical services. More than half have no coverage for physician home and office visits. A minuscule number have coverage for dental costs.

Under National Health Security, every resident of the United States will be eligible to receive virtually the entire range of personal health care services without deductibles or coinsurance.

FINANCING

Financing of medical care today is a patchwork effort of personal, private, state, local and federal funds. Medical bills are paid part by private insurance, part out of workers' pockets, part out of welfare funds, part out of Medicare.

For example, state and local governments are burdened with a \$2.5 billion a year expenditure for health care, plus approximately \$500 million a year to provide private health insurance for their employees.

National Health Security will be financed by taxes on employers, employees, the self-employed and unearned individual income, as well as from general revenues.

The workers' share—1% of wages and unearned income up to a total of \$15,000—represents no new tax. Workers are now paying almost that amount toward Medicare. Further, National Health Security would significantly reduce workers' out-of-pocket, non-reimbursed medical expenses with the added bonus of better and more complete medical care.

Self-employed persons would be taxed at a 2.5% rate up to \$15,000.

The employer's contribution—3.5% on payrolls—is about what many employers now pay for inadequate private health insurance for their employees. Some pay much more; some pay less; some pay none.

General tax revenues would account for the remainder of the Health Security Trust Fund—approximately 50% of the total. This is not all new money. Medicaid, Medicare and other medical costs already constitute a significant and growing portion of the federal budget. Health Security would absorb these costs.

The program would also result in a direct form of revenue sharing by relieving state and local governments of much of their present health care burdens. Additionally, state and local government employees would receive comprehensive benefits at no cost to the governmental units.

COSTS

The explosion in medical costs is playing havoc with budgets—personal and governmental.

Last year, the average worker spent \$324 on medical care for himself—\$324 for his wife, and \$324 for each of his children—that is 10% more than 1969 per individual. Medical care costs have been rising at least twice as fast as the general cost of living. Blue Cross premiums have more than doubled, on the average, since the late 1950s.

Union bargaining committees are faced with the dilemma of rising medical costs at every negotiation session. Reasonable wage gains are sacrificed for improvements in health insurance, only to find that their members' medical expenses increase faster than the increase in coverage.

Private insurance companies are unwilling or incapable of dealing with increased costs.

They have acted simply as a pass-through mechanism, paying for whatever care was offered, good or bad, needed or unneeded, efficient or inefficient. Their rates go up not only to pay for increased medical costs of policyholders, but also to maintain profit margins and pay high operating expenses.

National Health Security will have effective fiscal controls by contracting with hospitals and other institutional providers on the basis of an approved budget, and by maximum emphasis on prepayment to contracting groups, such as medical and dental societies.

The program will not constrict individual liberty. Doctors will be free to choose whether or not they will participate. Doctors can be paid by all present methods. There will be no lay interference with their professional judgment. Doctors will be freed from choosing treatment and services on the basis of a patient's ability to pay. Doctors will be freed from the timeconsuming paperwork of billing patients.

Patients will be free to choose their physicians and health delivery systems. And their family physicians, in turn, will be free to refer patients to specialists. Patients will be freed from financial worries and will be able to seek medical care before it is too late.

DEVELOPMENT

An essential feature of National Health Security is the Health Resources Development Fund which will be used for health manpower education and training, group practice development and other means to expand and improve health care personnel facilities and services.

Enactment of the Health Security program will create increased expectations and demands for services. The Health Resources Development Fund will come into operation two years before benefits begin. It will help insure that as people need medical care, the care will be there.

REFORM

At present, health care is fragmented, disorganized, inadequate and spotty. It is a non-system—a haphazard collection of isolated and uncoordinated institutions.

The result is that care is often received at the most expensive location—hospitals—because that is where doctors are assured of being paid, when the doctor could treat the patient just as well and sometimes better in his office. Doctors and hospitals now are only paid when patients are ill; preventive medicine and early treatment are not practiced to the degree that will reduce illness and shorten hospital stays.

National Health Security has built-in financial, professional and other incentives to encourage organized arrangements for patient care and to encourage prevention and early diagnosis and treatment of disease.

Hospitals will be encouraged to increase efficiency; to cooperate in planning, purchase and utilization of new equipment, and to eliminate unnecessary, wasteful and duplicative expenditures. Doctors will be given a financial stake in keeping their patients well. Care will be provided at the best—not the most expensive—location.

National Health Security—introduced in the House (H.R. 22) by Reps. Griffiths, Cornman, Reid and Mosher and in the Senate (S. 3) by Sens. Kennedy, Cooper and Saxbe—is the proper program to provide quality health care for all Americans. The AFL-CIO is proud to endorse it.

We arrived at our decision after careful examination of other proposals—some substantive and some merely crude attempts to avoid needed reforms in the present system of delivering health care.

The American Medical Association's "medicredit" plan and the private insurance carriers' "Healthcare" proposal are thinly dis-

guised efforts to protect vested interests and insurance company profits. They are band-aids, where surgery is required.

There are other proposals—such as the bills introduced by Senators Javits and Pell and the proposal of the American Hospital Association—which are much more substantive. (Senators Javits and Pell are also cosponsors of S. 3.)

But, generally, all of the proposals, except National Health Security, lack at least one of the following: equal access to health care for all people; comprehensive coverage; restructuring of the health care system; effective incentives for quality and efficiency or controls on costs; or they depend on inadequate private insurance as carriers or intermediaries or both.

It has been nearly a year since President Nixon declared there is a "massive crisis" in the area of health care and a threat of a "breakdown" of the medical care system. In that time, he has met that crisis by vetoing a hospital construction bill and a measure to provide for the training of more family doctors, and he threatened to close down vitally-needed Public Health Service hospitals.

After taking one action after another to forestall urgently needed health care measures, the President has at long last delivered a health message.

This Council has not had sufficient time to thoroughly analyze the President's proposals which though lengthy are nevertheless devoid of many essential details. We have noted one or two constructive features such as the President's belated recognition that prepaid group practice can deliver better medical care at less cost and his proposal to eliminate the onerous Medicare premium the elderly must now pay.

But it is evident that the President's approach taken as a whole, is both piecemeal and inadequate. It places main reliance on discredited private insurance which has been largely responsible for the high cost, low quality medical care we have today. Under the President's proposals, there is no indication that either the private insurance organizations or the providers of medical care would be subject to effective cost controls or quality incentives.

His proposals fall far short of meeting the "massive crisis" in health care the President has himself recognized.

The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to enact the bi-partisan National Health Security Program during this session so that it will be able to go into operation in 1974. Further, we pledge our unstinting efforts to that goal. It is and will remain our No. 1 legislative goal until victory has been won.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO HONORED

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week my dear friend and colleague FRANK ANNUNZIO was honored in Chicago by the Illinois Retail Liquor Stores Association for his work in the area of crime insurance legislation providing direct Federal coverage in areas where it was not available or where its cost was prohibitive.

I wish to commend and congratulate him for his fine efforts.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues and my fellow Americans in commemorating the 53d anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed herself a free and sovereign Republic. Although she courageously succeeded in resisting foreign domination during the First World War, Lithuania was occupied and subjugated by the Russian Army in 1944.

Despite military occupation and political repression, Lithuanian patriots and freedom-loving people throughout the world are determined to make the dream of self-determination a reality. I sincerely hope that this observance will help to mobilize international opinion behind the efforts of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia to regain their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the 53d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of Shenandoah, Pa. The Rev. Msgr. J. A. Karalius, a leader in our Lithuanian-American community, was kind enough to provide me with a copy of this policy statement, the full text of which follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed on the 16th day of February, 1918, and thereafter, following admission to the League of Nations in 1921, its independence was recognized by the Great Powers of the world; and

Whereas, the Republic of Lithuania having thus emerged once more as a free and independent country after having been oppressed since the late 18th century by the Russian Monarchy; and

Whereas, the Soviet States of Russia proclaimed to the world in 1920 its belief in freedom and independence and the right of a free peoples to govern themselves by, *inter alia*, entering into a treaty with Lithuania wherein we read these binding words, "relying on the strength of a declaration made by the Federal Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia to the effect that all peoples of every nationality have the right of self-determination and complete separation from the State to which they belonged previously, Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent State with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and, in a spirit of free and good will, renounce all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her. The fact that Lithuania for some time was under Russian sovereignty does not impose on the Lithuanian people and their territory any obligation towards Russia;" and

Whereas, having thus had a new birth of freedom establishing a republican form of government with universal and equal suffrage, Lithuania, as a nation dedicated itself to the task of peace, industry, commerce and learning, free and harmonious relations in the community of nations of the world; and

Whereas, the government of Lithuania, eager to preserve its freedom and happiness

and with prophetic guidance as to the source of danger to its newly acquired independence and freedom, entered into a Lithuanian-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact on September 28, 1926, which by mutual consent was to be effective until December 31, 1945, read in part: "Article 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other;" and

Whereas, the government and people of Lithuania have no national, religious, economic, political or cultural interests similar or akin to the Russian government or its peoples, but differ therefrom in every conceivable aspect, yet, nevertheless, the Republic of Lithuania was annexed by Russia in violation of the existing treaties, and in violation of international law, by the overpowering force and subterfuge of the Russian Government, whereby through the vehicle of a sham election, controlled and dominated by the communistic government, the Republic of Lithuania was incorporated into the United Soviet States of Russia against the will of all of the Lithuanian inhabitants; and

Whereas, the Government of the United States being interested, in accordance with its avowed declaration in the Atlantic Charter, to permit other peoples of the world desiring freedom to remain free and independent; and

Whereas, the Government of the United States declared war against Germany and Japan to thwart and prevent aggression and tyranny to spread its evil forces; and

Whereas, the Republic of Lithuania, following World War I, emerged as a free and independent nation and since demonstrated its ability of capable self-government, and now, following World War II, finds itself deprived of its freedom by a communistic Russia, and its people living under a government alien and differing in every respect from the desires of its people;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that we, loyal citizens of the United States, of Lithuanian birth or descent, meeting at the Shenandoah Lith Club auditorium this 31st day of January, A.D., 1971, do hereby express our united voices in urging the President and the State Department of the United States and the Agencies of the United States Government to exert fully the courageous efforts of this government in doing its utmost to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania; and

Be it further resolved, that we beseech the President of the United States and the State Department to request forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupational forces from Lithuanian territory and to further request of the United Soviet States of Russia that the Lithuanian people who have been deported from their country to slave labor camps in Siberia and elsewhere be returned to their homes and families in Lithuania; and

Be it further resolved, that we petition the President, the State Department of the United States and Senate Foreign Relations Committee to refrain from signing or ratifying any treaty involving the Baltic region of Europe which fails to embody the free and independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and to present our pleas and supplications for justice and humaneness contained herein to the proper authorities of the United Nations for appropriate action as may be necessary to effect such results of independence and justice; and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President, the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Senators of the United States from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to our Representative in Congress from this district, with a hope and trust that each one, in such manner as he

or it may choose, lend every effort toward fostering, aiding and achieving the independence of a people who wish to be free to govern themselves and loosening them from the shackles of communism.

The foregoing Resolutions were passed by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pennsylvania, at a meeting held this 31st day of January, A.D., 1971, at the Lithuanian Social Club Auditorium located in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, by acclamation and unanimous vote.

UNITED STATES SHOULD CONSIDER MIRV BAN

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, world peace is desired by men of goodwill everywhere. This is why the United States, when presented with the opportunity to advance the cause of world peace, should make every effort to do so.

I am speaking now about the mutual development by the United States and Russia of the MIRV, the multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle.

Herbert Scoville, writing in the New York Times of February 9, believes that the United States by initiating a ban on production, testing, and deployment of the MIRV, could force the Soviet Union to adopt similar measures.

Scoville says:

New Weapons Development programs seem to possess momentum to outstrip the plodding pace of the arms control negotiations. Is this not the time for the United States to provide the necessary leadership to obtain limitations on MIRV's before it is really too late? If the Soviets are really slowing their SS-9 deployment and have already begun testing MIRV's, the United States should use this new situation as a trigger to examine its policies. The risks from an unlimited MIRV race far outweigh those from possible violations of a MIRV ban.

I include Mr. Scoville's complete article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1971]

THE PROBLEM OF MIRV: II

(By Herbert Scoville)

WASHINGTON.—The control of MIRV's, which would provide such great security and economic benefits for both the United States and the Soviet Union, can be achieved by imposing a ban on MIRV testing and production as well as deployment.

Fortunately, adequate verification of a ban on MIRV testing is easier than one on deployment since it can be achieved by "national" means alone. Some tests leading toward development of MIRV—Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles—capability could be carried out by the Soviet Union under the guise of other weapons development or even a space program. However, any MIRV system that is not flight-tested at essentially full range could never be deployed with confidence that it had high reliability and accuracy.

The United States has been able to observe Soviet ICBM firings ever since the program was initiated in 1957 and it would undoubtedly be able to observe multiple warheads were these tested at full range. Test firings of the SS-9 with MIRV's in space

without re-entry or with only a single warhead re-entering the atmosphere would not provide the Russians with a system that they could deploy with confidence.

In the case of submarine missiles, the verification might be a little less certain. However, even in this case, the chance of detecting a multiple re-entry vehicle firing would be good.

A ban on production of MIRV's would be extremely difficult for the United States to verify since the MIRV stage of the missile could be manufactured in relatively small facilities. It would be necessary to have a right to carry out large numbers of onsite inspections. Such inspection would almost certainly be unacceptable to the Soviets; probably also to United States industry.

Thus, only in the testing phase would the United States be able to verify an agreement limiting MIRV's. Fortunately, the Soviets have only just begun MIRV testing and would require a year or more before a deployable system could be available. Therefore, the United States could protect its security under a comprehensive ban on MIRV production, testing and deployment through verification of the testing phase. It could be confident that as long as the Soviets had not extensively tested their MIRV's, they would not carry out any widespread production or deployment. The risks to United States security would be extremely low—certainly less than if the Soviets were allowed to develop freely an optimal MIRV system for their SS-9.

The risks to the security of either the United States or the Soviet Union would be much greater from an unrestrained MIRV race than from a ban on the production, testing and deployment of such weapons.

Why then do both countries appear so reluctant to negotiate seriously such a ban? Despite repeated urgings from the Congress, the Administration has refused to halt its MIRV testing and deployment programs even though a Soviet ABM that would require their existence could not be operational for many years and even though the halt were made contingent on similar Soviet restraint in the MIRV and ABM areas. In place of such a bilateral limitation, the Government has opted for a unilateral United States ban on MIRV accuracy improvements which is not likely to reassure any Soviet planner.

There seems to have been little or no serious discussion of MIRV's at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks by either side, and the United States appears to be seeking onsite inspection to verify a deployment ban, a move probably considered by the Soviets as a signal of lack of serious United States threat.

Why has the Soviet Union not raised the issue of MIRV's earlier on at the strategic arms talks? While it is understandable that they do not wish to be frozen in a position of inferiority, it is quite likely that had serious negotiations been undertaken at an earlier stage, United States MIRV deployment might have been forestalled. An early MIRV ban would have been clearly in their interest. Unfortunately, the Russian leaders seem reluctant to make a proposal that would be controversial to some segments of their society without some assurance that it would be accepted by the United States.

New weapons development programs seem to possess momentum to outstrip the plodding pace of arms control negotiations. Is this not the time for the United States to provide the necessary leadership to obtain limitations on MIRV's before it is really too late? If the Soviets are really slowing their SS-9 deployment and have already begun testing MIRV's, the United States should use this new situation as a trigger to re-examine its policies. The risks from an unlimited MIRV race far outweigh those from possible violations of a MIRV ban.

CONSERVATIVE AWARDS DINNER

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this month the Conservative awards dinner was held here in Washington, honoring Congressman ROBERT MICHEL and Senator CLIFFORD HANSEN. It was an outstanding event and one which I believe deserves recognition. It was organized by the American Conservative Union, the Young Americans for Freedom, Human Events, and the National Review. The guest of honor was Senator JAMES BUCKLEY who had such a tremendous victory this past November in New York. I wish to present the text of remarks of Senator BUCKLEY and the list of outstanding Americans who attended the event:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY SENATOR
JAMES L. BUCKLEY

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to join you in honoring Senator Hansen and Congressman Michel. Each has served the Nation with distinction—both in positive terms and, at times, through a holding action which has withstood and delayed the pell mell rush to collectivism which has plagued America in the last decade. They have helped buy time—time within which increasing numbers of Americans have begun to assess, in the cold light of reality, the heady rhetoric of the new and fair deals, the new frontier and the great society.

We are now in the throes of a massive national hangover created by the excesses of the past. I am persuaded that Americans in significant numbers are now in the mood to take the pledge; if only we can help them fight off the temptation to try a bit of the hair of the dog.

This is what I want to talk to you about tonight—this new mood in the land. And there is a new mood, or I would not be addressing you tonight, nor would not have the privilege of calling Senator Hansen and Congressman Michel "colleague."

During the last few years we have heard a great deal about a new politics, even about a new culture—and about the marvelous things that were in store for us as a result. In retrospect, all that now seems actually to have been new about the new politics is merely stylistic. The new politics of the late 1960's knew how to make use of the media, and it mobilized its volunteers. But as it appeared, briefly, in the McCarthy movement, and as it appeared on the political scene more generally, as the movement, it did not in fact ever repudiate the themes of the older liberalism. With respect to goals, it merely turned up the volume, as at a rock concert.

Where the older orthodox liberals wanted Federal power to achieve their egalitarian goals, the new politics, so-called, wanted to impose equality today, instantly. The older liberals deeply distrusted the capitalist system. The new politics of the late 1960's hammered away at capitalism incessantly, attacking it as "materialism" or the "military industrial complex." The older liberalism disliked what it called the "nation state"—an ungainly phrase meant to stand in invidious contrast to the dawning "world state." The putative world state, it was understood, would establish permanent peace and prosperity. The new politics leaped over all this intervening and highly theoretical business and called for peace now. The great complaint of the new politics, so called, as it emerged in 1968 and 1969 actually under-

lined its essential lack of newness. Characteristically, it pointed to the gap between liberal promises and liberal performance. But the alleged "new" spokesmen never seemed to doubt that the promises and the principles behind them were just fine. They merely charged that the promises had not been fulfilled—and further, that they had not been fulfilled because those who had made them were hypocrites. Nothing could be clearer than that the so-called new politics was really the old liberal politics, all the same assumptions, all the same goals—though charging that the older liberals had not been militant enough. Nothing much was new about the new politics. It was merely more excited, and infinitely less civil. And it offered the American public no basis for new hope.

Against this background, you can appreciate my astonishment, when, in the elation of victory on election night, I found myself proclaiming—on live television, in color, coast-to-coast—that I owed my election to a "new politics" and that I was its voice. And it seems now that I am stuck with the phrase despite its copyright by the new left, and despite my normally fastidious respect for property rights.

But now that Richard Nixon is talking about more power to the people, I feel better about my preemption of the term. For it appears, if I may paraphrase Barry Goldwater, that plagiarism in pursuit of politics is no vice.

But I do feel compelled to explain what it was that I anointed myself the voice of—if only to dispel the notion that I took that occasion to make my first overture to the left.

Anyone closely associated with the New York political scene last fall understood what I was talking about. Because I was elected by a coalition which cut across the traditional political spectrum. It was a coalition which included an astonishing 42 per cent of New York's blue collar vote. Over 900,000 democrats crossed over to the conservative party line to give me over 40 per cent of my total vote. And at least as of November 3rd of last year, it was a coalition which represented a majority sentiment in New York State. I say this on the authority of Charles Goodell, who has confirmed that well over half of his vote came from traditional republican loyalists who in a run-off would have voted for me.

But there was much more to my campaign than the fact of a coalition which a handful of liberal commentators have tried to explain away as a conglomerate of haters—the sinister forces marshalled by "the night riders of the hard right," to use the rhetoric of one New York Times editorial.

Quite the contrary. It wasn't fear which caused tens of thousands of men and women to become involved for the first time in their lives in a political effort, and one at that which all the pros knew was doomed to failure. It wasn't hate which caused more than 40 thousand individuals to mail in contributions. It wasn't a hardening of political arteries which mobilized the largest, most effective corps of student volunteers to work for any candidate anywhere in the country during the 1970 campaign.

Rather, it was love of country, an abiding faith in country, an overriding concern for the welfare of America which brought together the coalition which elected me. Think back to the tremors which swept this nation a year ago, which shocked Americans into a realization of the extent to which American institutions and values had been eroded. They had witnessed a paralysis of authority as wave after wave of filth and violence reached their climax last May in the mindless orgy of destruction which burned a hundred campuses. And everywhere Americans turned, they saw other signs of a deep-seated national trouble: the seemingly uncontrollable rise in crime rates and welfare rolls; the disruption of trials; the explosion of pornography; the flight from reality mani-

festated both by the Woodstock phenomenon and the peace-at-any-price movement, the emergence of a small hard-core of self-professed revolutionaries. Small wonder that Americans in and out of New York felt an unprecedented concern last year over the institutional health of their country. This was the mood in New York throughout the campaign, a mood which I believe caused New Yorkers to vote for what they considered to be the national interest rather than for their private interests.

I know that it is difficult to read national trends into last year's elections. In state after state it is clear that local issues or acute economic dislocations had a decisive influence on the outcome.

But this was not the case in New York. There were no overriding local or economic issues. The campaign provided the voters with sharply defined alternatives, and the voters opted for the conservative alternative. Because they had concluded that on the really critical issues, the conservative view was the right view. I submit, therefore, that what happened in New York last fall has a deep significance for use here tonight and for the country.

I believe we stand at a turning point. There is a fluidity in the political scene, a regrouping going on as Americans search for more realistic, more effective approaches to government. And if New York is any indication, Americans are showing a new predisposition to listen to the conservative analysis and a new willingness to become directly involved in the political process. This is a willingness borne of a sense of urgency, and founded on a continuing faith in the essential soundness of the American system. This is the authentic "new politics" which I had in mind when I proclaimed myself the voice of that politics. It is a politics structured on reality, and a new understanding as to what reality is.

We have a significant opportunity to reshape the politics of this country precisely because the people are searching for new answers, honest answers—answers which substitute common sense for theory, and toughness for soft-headedness. And it is because of this new mood and understanding that we who have labored in the vineyard of conservatism have cause for hope.

There have been a number of factors which have opened up this opportunity. Perhaps the most important of these has been the palpable failure of the panaceas spun out by the liberal utopians. The liberal theologians have promised us that every one of our problems could and would be solved if only enough authority were concentrated in Washington and enough billions spent by the superior brains who have settled along the banks of the Potomac. Their programs have been adopted, the sprawling bureaucracies have been created, and those billions upon billions of dollars have been spent. But nothing has been solved. The problems have merely grown more acute while government has increasingly intruded itself into every corner of the lives of its citizens.

Another, most important factor is the enduring common sense of the American people—a common sense which has restored sanity to our public affairs in the past and which can save us again if we will deal honestly with the public. The American people understand that we live in a predatory world and that we must look to our own defenses, if we are to remain secure and independent. They understand that in a world of nuclear missiles we can no longer retreat to a policy of isolationism. They understand the need for firmness in law enforcement if we are to cope with crime; and because they know human nature, they know that a free society cannot co-exist with chaos. They can sense what is false in political cant, and increasingly they resent being patronized or deceived. They are ready, in short, for a politics which will make a serious

and sustained effort to bring political assumptions, political expectations and political language into the closest possible intimacy with reality.

This is the task which faces the conservative community today. Much has been accomplished already—especially by the distinguished organizations which have sponsored this dinner tonight. These sponsors have formulated and sustained an intelligent critique of the prevailing orthodoxies, and they have channeled conservative energies into increasingly effective political action.

Most importantly, they have brought to young Americans a new awareness of the validity and utility of conservative insights. As a result, thousands of our brightest young men and women have found intellectually satisfying and realistic alternatives to the tired proposals of the old left and the strident demands of the new. And because these young people have had to test their thinking in the inhospitable climate of the academic world, they have achieved a knowledge and a grasp of fundamentals which is giving them a growing influence among their peers.

But if we are to take the fullest advantage of the opportunities now being opened to us, we must do much more. We must take the initiative in formulating and then selling workable alternatives in a number of areas where conservatives have too often been silent. A new politics of reality requires that we be able to demonstrate, for example, that we know how to cope with pollution without turning back the technological clock; that we can give minority groups effective access to economic opportunities without governmental paternalism; that the health needs of the poor can be adequately provided for without clamping a single program of government insurance on the entire population.

We who pride ourselves on our sense of reality, and on the fact that the principles which guide us are based on the realities of human nature, we must never lose sight of the fact that we must operate within the here and now. Because among the realities within which we must operate are the political realities. This is particularly true of those of us who are Members of the Congress. Time and again we will be called upon to make pragmatic judgments as to which of the less than ideal alternatives is achievable, which will advance us toward our goals, however circuitously. There will also be times when a proposal which is intellectually sound will be so out of phase with what is politically possible that an attempt to advance it would be worse than futile.

But events move rapidly in the political world; and whereas there is little we can do to change the realities of human nature, we can work to shape the climate which defines what is politically possible. This requires persuasiveness and an infinite degree of patience; and above all it requires that we suppress the all-or-nothing impulse which has frustrated so many conservative enterprises in the past.

As we move into the 1970's, I propose that we fare forward with a new spirit and a new resolve; that we summon the will and the courage to see things as they really are. And if we do, we will find the American people with us. Because we continue to be a special breed, prepared to accept the world for what it is while still pursuing our special vision of what it ought to be.

The New Testament has taught us that the man who loves the world to excess will lose it. But there surely is a corollary. He who fails to see the world will most certainly lose it too.

LIST OF GUESTS

[Alphabetical listing and table]

Congressman Thomas Abernethy, 9.
Mr. Dan Adams, 33.

Mr. Robert F. Adams, 60.
Mr. David Adcock, 31.
Mrs. Spiro T. Agnew, 5.
Mr. and Mrs. Holmes Alexander, 40.
Mr. and Mrs. Lyndon (Mort) Allin, 40.
Mr. and Mrs. Allin, Sr., 40.
Mr. James Altham, 64.
Dr. H. Ford Anderson and guest, 68.
Dr. and Mrs. Martin Anderson, 3.
Mrs. Richard C. Anderson, 31.
Dr. A. J. App, 71.
Congressman and Mrs. William Archer, 5.
Mr. and Mrs. George Armstrong, 8.
Mr. and Mrs. Al Arnett, 28.
Congressman John M. Ashbrook, Head.
Dr. and Mrs. James Atkinson, 52.
Mr. J. L. Auspitz, 41.
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Baker, 46.
Reverend Kenneth Baker, 42.
Congressman and Mrs. LaMar Baker, 40.
Mr. Joseph Baldacchino, 52.
Mr. Alexander Barmine, 72.
Mr. and Mrs. William J. Baroody, Sr., 18.
Mr. and Mrs. William J. Baroody, Jr., 1.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Bauman, 39.
Mr. Lionel Baxter, 34.
Mrs. Joseph Beaudette, 66.
Miss Mary Lou Beehler, 66.
Captain David Bell, 51.
Mr. Jeffrey Bell, 16.
Miss Joyce Bellinger, 54.
Mr. Ralph Bennett, 46.
Mr. Richard Bernstein, 72.
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Berry, 70.
Mr. and Mrs. C. Richard Beyda, 47.
Congressman and Mrs. Ben B. Blackburn, 7.
Mr. Dexter Blome, 69.
Mr. Patrick Boarman, 32.
Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Bode, 37.
Mr. Thomas A. Bolan, 11.
Mr. Michael J. Bonafield, 10.
Mr. Don Boyd, 72.
Congressman and Mrs. William G. Bray, 7.
Miss Rita Bree, 38.
Mr. Patrick J. Breheny, 62.
Mr. Stephen Brett, 34.
Mr. Daniel Buckley, 31.
Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan and Guest, 19.
Senator James Buckley, Head.
Congressman and Mrs. J. Herbert Burke, 39.
Mr. Richard C. Byron and Guest, 68.
Mr. Douglas Caddy, 71.
Mr. Jameson Campaign, Jr, 16.
Mr. Frank Carrington, 16.
Mr. Anderson Carter, 29.
Mr. Robert E. Case, 3.
Mr. and Mrs. Henry C. Cashen II, 29.
Mr. John R. Cassidy, 59.
Mr. William Caudell, 60.
Mr. John Chamberlain, 5.
Mr. Joseph Charpentier, 59.
Miss Dawne Cina, 1.
Miss Beverly Classon, 6.
Mrs. Phillip Coffin, 54.
Mrs. Charles Cole, 54.
Miss Janis Cole, 54.
Mr. Tom Cole and Guests, 63.
Miss Celeste M. Collins, 34.
Congressman and Mrs. James Collins, 18.
Congressman and Mrs. William Colmer, 26.
Mr. James Conrad, 67.
Mrs. W. J. Corcoran, 44.
Mr. and Mrs. Larry Cott, 25.
Mr. William Cotter, 12.
Mr. and Mrs. John Cox, 15.
Mr. and Mrs. A. Melville Cox, 67.
Mr. Kent Crane, 36.
Congressman Philip M. Crane, Head.
Mrs. Philip M. Crane, 38.
Mrs. Winston Crickenberger, 71.
Mr. and Mrs. Harry H. Cupp, 53.
Mr. Joseph W. Darling, 34.
Mr. John Davenport, 75.
Mr. Harold F. Davis, 69.
Mr. Jeff Davis, 44.
Miss Mary K. Davis, 19.
Mr. Ronald B. Dear, 47.
Mr. DeCorps, 67.
Mr. Dellenoci, 70.
Mr. and Mrs. George Dennison, 20.
Mr. Ralph de Toledano, 15.

Dr. and Mrs. Donald Devine, 48.
Congressman Samuel L. Devine, 18.
Mr. William G. DiGregorio, 58.
Rev. Walter B. Diamond, 58.
Mr. and Mrs. Lev. E. Dobriansky, 29.
Mr. Ronald Docksal, Head.
Mr. Frank Donatelli, 62.
Miss Vera Dorn, 57.
Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn, 24.
Mr. Patrick Dowd, 12.
Mr. Tom Duke, 72.
Congressman and Mrs. John Duncan, 45.
Mrs. Marcella DuPont, 68.
Mr. Charles T. Duvall and Guest, 68.
Mr. and Mrs. Lee Edwards, 28.
Mr. Marvin Edwards, 1.
Mr. and Mrs. Willard Edwards, 7.
Mr. Harmon L. Elder, 35.
Mr. Stephen Embry, 49.
Mr. and Mrs. Clifton Enfield, 10.
Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Ertel, 44.
Mr. M. Stanton Evans, Head.
Senator and Mrs. Paul Fannin, 4.
Mr. Michael Feld, 49.
Mr. and Mrs. Ed Feulner, 2.
Dr. and Mrs. Finley, 70.
Congressman O. C. Fisher, 14.
Mr. and Mrs. Ed Foreman, 42.
Mr. Albert Forrester, 35.
Mrs. Janet Fouse and Guest, 1.
Mr. Neal Freeman, 38.
Mr. Howard Frye, 55.
Miss Mary W. Garner and two Guests, 60.
Mr. Devin A. Garrity, 50.
Mr. and Mrs. William Gavin, 18.
Mr. and Mrs. John C. Gemmill, 52.
Mr. William Gill, 72.
Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth O. Gilmore, 3.
Mr. and Mrs. Julian C. Gonzalez, 69.
Mr. Edward Goodwin, 59.
Mr. and Mrs. Martin Gorman, 53.
Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Gorman, 53.
Mr. and Mrs. Burton Gray, 16.
Mr. Scott Grigsby, 65.
Mr. Phil Guarino, 70.
Mr. Jack Gullahorn, 41.
Mr. Joseph A. Gwyer, 72.
Dr. Otis Hackenbush, 34.
Mr. Dan Hales, 16.
Congressman and Mrs. Durward Hall, 28.
Miss Rachael Halterman, 15.
Congressman and Mrs. John P. Hammer-schmidt, 47.
Senator Clifford P. Hansen, Head.
Mrs. Clifford Hansen, 17.
Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Harbaugh, 13.
Mr. Anthony Harrigan, 50.
Mrs. Ione Harrington, 38.
Miss Sandra Hartman, 52.
Mr. Daryl Harvey and three Guests, 59.
Mr. Bob Hawthorne, 39.
Mr. Tim Healy, 33.
Mr. Charles L. Heatherly, 10.
Mr. J. C. Holms, 43.
Mr. Harold Herring, 6.
Mr. Bruce Herschensohn and Guest, 73.
Mr. Phillip E. Hicks and Guest, 50.
Mr. and Mrs. Wilmer B. Hill, 35.
Mrs. Hinton, 36.
Congressman Lawrence Hogan, 1.
Mr. and Mrs. Vern Holleman, 30.
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Holtz, 26.
Dr. John Howard, 51.
Miss Marjorie Hull, 34.
Mr. Theodore Humes, 65.
Mr. and Mrs. Howard Hunt and Guest, 71.
Mr. Harris Huston and Guest, 73.
Congressman and Mrs. Edward Hutchinson, 52.
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Hyde, Jr., 48.
Mr. Kenneth Ingwalson, 57.
Mr. Reed J. Irvine, 65.
Mr. and Mrs. John B. Jacob, 36.
Dr. Walter D. Jacobs, 49.
Mr. Wayne C. Johnson, 60.
Mr. and Mrs. David Jones, 38.
Mr. John L. Jones, Head.
Mrs. John L. Jones, 28.
Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Joy, 37.
Dr. and Mrs. Walter Judd, 30.

Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Kalish, 12.
 Mr. William Kanninen, 13.
 Mr. and Mrs. David Keene, 15.
 Mr. Bob Kelly, 65.
 Mr. and Mrs. William Kendall, 65.
 Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kephart, 27.
 Dr. Howard E. Kershner, 13.
 Mr. Kerwitz and Seven Guests, 61.
 Miss Kieram Klicullen, 33.
 Mr. Harry J. King and Guest, 55.
 Mr. H. C. Kleinstuber and Guest, 58.
 Mr. and Mrs. William Konze, 60.
 Mrs. Eugene Kunst, 44.
 Miss Margie Kunst, 44.
 Congressman and Mrs. Earl Landgrebe, 9.
 General and Mrs. Thomas Lane, 6.
 Mr. Reed Larson, 36.
 Mr. Henry Larzelere and Guest, 55.
 Mr. and Mrs. Victor Lasky, 6.
 Congressman Delbert Latta, 51.
 Mr. Frank Laurence, 57.
 Mr. and Mrs. George Laurence, 29.
 Dr. and Mrs. Martin La Vor, 24.
 Mr. and Mrs. Wyatt L. Law III, 20.
 Miss Joan Lawton, 33.
 Mr. Joseph Leo and Guest, 8.
 Mrs. Evelyn Leonard, 32.
 Mr. Fulton Lewis III, 3.
 Mr. John F. Lewis, 49.
 Mr. David S. Lichtenstein, 75.
 Mr. James Linen, 5.
 Mr. Theodore Lit, 24.
 Mr. Bertram Lloyd and Guest, 55.
 Mrs. Katharine N. Lloyd, 64.
 Mr. and Mrs. John Lofton, 19.
 Miss Eleanor L. Long, 75.
 Mr. Gordon Luce, 17.
 Mr. and Mrs. James Lucier, 24.
 Congressman and Mrs. Manuel Lujan, 25.
 Mr. Eugene Lyons, 25.
 Reverend Daniel Lyons, S.J., 42.
 Mrs. William MacCracken, 64.
 Mr. and Mrs. Alan MacKay, 30.
 Dr. and Mrs. H. Mackensen, 35.
 Mr. and Mrs. J. Daniel Mahoney, 31.
 Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Maines, 8.
 Mr. and Mrs. Fendall Marbury, 73.
 Mrs. Rose Martin, 9.
 Mr. and Mrs. Frederick P. Mascioli, 57.
 Mr. Russ Mather, 47.
 Mr. and Mrs. Charles T. Mayer, 11.
 Mr. Steve Mayerhofer, 13.
 Mrs. Marquita Maytag, 17.
 Miss Maureen McCaffrey, 62.
 Mr. and Mrs. Neil McCaffrey, 27.
 Mr. J. Laurence McCarty, 5.
 Congressman and Mrs. James McClure, 2.
 Miss Jean F. McElligott, 23.
 Mr. Martin McGuigan, 55.
 Mrs. McMahon, 68.
 Mr. and Mrs. Francis J. McNamara, 32.
 Mr. Leslie Megyeri, 56.
 Mr. Frank S. Meyer, Head.
 Mr. John Meyers, 59.
 Miss Lea Meyers, 38.
 Congressman Robert Michels, Head.
 Mr. E. Victor Millone, 45.
 Congressman and Mrs. Clarence E. Miller, 48.
 Miss Gayle Miller, 72.
 Mr. and Mrs. Michael Miller, 11.
 Mr. D. Thomas Miller, 13.
 Mr. Jay Mincks, 10.
 Mr. Jeff Mincks, 10.
 Congressman and Mrs. Wilmer D. Mizell, 20.
 Mr. Robert Moffit, 25.
 Mrs. Theodore Mohlman, 72.
 Mr. and Mrs. Clark Mollenhoff, 4.
 Mr. Charles H. Morin, 44.
 Mr. Ralph Taylor Munroe, 43.
 Mr. Murdock, 36.
 Mr. Pat Nagel, 34.
 Mr. and Mrs. Dale Ness, 71.
 Mr. Frederic Nelson, 2.
 Mr. Garrick Newman, 4.
 Mr. Philip Nicolaides, 32.
 Miss Jane Nofsinger, 39.
 Mrs. Frances W. Nolde, 75.
 Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Norton, 26.
 Mr. and Mrs. Keiran O'Doherty, 31.

Mr. D. Olivier, 62.
 Mr. and Mrs. Paul O'Neill, 42.
 Mr. Otto Otepka, 47.
 Mrs. Nancy Palm, 35.
 Mr. Andrew Parker, Jr. and Guest, 11.
 Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Parker, 37.
 Mr. Kenneth Wells Parkinson, 45.
 Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Parrish, 17.
 Mr. Ronald Pearson, 11.
 Mr. Donald Pemberton, 37.
 Mrs. Phillip Pendleton, 54.
 Congressman and Mrs. Jerry Pettis, 8.
 Mr. John Pfeiffer, 62.
 Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Philbrick, 50.
 Mr. and Mrs. Kevin Phillips, 41.
 Mr. Roscoe Pickett and Guest, 76.
 Mr. Mike Pikosky, 14.
 Miss Hillary Pitcairn, 54.
 Mrs. Joel Pitcairn, 54.
 Miss Kate Pitcairn, 54.
 Mr. Richard Plechner, 13.
 Mr. and Mrs. Fred Poole, 51.
 Dr. Stefan Possomy, 41.
 Mr. Lawrence D. Pratt, 51.
 Press Tables, 21, 22, 23.
 Mr. Carleton Putnam, 66.
 Mr. D. L. Ray and Guest, 67.
 Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Rayman, 69.
 Miss Susan Reed, 61.
 Dr. A. R. Remsburg, Jr., 75.
 Mr. and Mrs. John L. Riordan, 64.
 Miss Eleanor K. Riser, 41.
 Mr. Charles Roach and Three Guests, 58.
 Judge and Mrs. Roger Robb, 5.
 Congressman and Mrs. Kenneth Robinson, 19.
 Mr. J. Rockowski, 12.
 Mr. and Mrs. Alan Rosenberg, 27.
 Congressman John Rouselot and Guest, 14.
 Miss Kathie Ross, 32.
 Dr. Edward Rozek, 12.
 Dr. and Mrs. William Runyeon, 45.
 Mr. Gary Russell, 36.
 Congressman and Mrs. Earl Ruth, 46.
 Mr. John Ryan, 44.
 Mr. Allan Ryskind, Head.
 Mrs. Allan Ryskind, 18.
 Honorable Katharine St. George, 4.
 Mr. R. Raysor Salley, Jr., 56.
 Mr. William Saracino, 41.
 Mr. Clare Sausser and Guest, 75.
 Mr. William Sawyer, 34.
 Mr. Henry C. Schadeberg, 47.
 Mr. Robert Schadler, 32.
 Mrs. Shirley Schebla, 25.
 Congressman and Mrs. William Scherle, 3.
 Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, 42.
 Mr. William Schneider, Jr., 26.
 Mr. Emerson Schmidt, 45.
 Congressman and Mrs. John Schmitz, 50.
 Professor and Mrs. Schnur, 74.
 Mr. and Mrs. John Schrote, 49.
 Mr. and Mrs. William Schulz, 46.
 Mr. George Schuyler, 25.
 Mr. Paul Scott, 64.
 Mr. and Mrs. R. K. Scott, 14.
 Mr. and Mrs. Andy Seamans, 76.
 Congressman Keith G. Sebelius, 24.
 Mr. Ray Semmens, 2.
 Mr. Lev V. Serdakovsky, 56.
 Mr. Frank Shakespeare, 17.
 Mr. and Mrs. Phil Sheats, 53.
 Mr. E. P. Shell, Jr., 73.
 Mr. and Mrs. William A. Shirer, 12.
 Dr. W. P. Skirball and Guest, 69.
 Mr. Edward J. Sloane, 73.
 Mrs. Marie Smith, 42.
 Dr. Nicholas Smyth and Guest, 74.
 Miss Susan M. Sokolove and Guest, 65.
 Miss Sylvia Somers and Guest, 65.
 Congressman Floyd D. Spence, 51.
 Mr. William G. Staton, 74.
 Mr. Arnie Steinberg, 9.
 Mr. Albert Stephens, 75.
 Miss Frances E. Stokes, 33.
 Miss Katherine Streitehoff, 57.
 Mr. Herbert W. Stupp, 62.
 Mr. Edward Sullivan, 29.
 Miss Joan Sweetland, 33.
 Mr. and Mrs. Jaquelin E. Taylor, 43.
 Mr. Randal Teague, Head.

Mrs. Randal Teague, 37.
 Teenage Republicans, 76.
 Congressman John H. Terry, 2.
 Congressman and Mrs. Charles Thone, 15.
 Congressman and Mrs. Fletcher Thompson, 64.
 Mr. Kenneth Thompson, 24.
 Mr. Michael Thompson, 4.
 Mr. Wayne Thorburn, 35.
 Senator and Mrs. Strom Thrumond, 6.
 Mr. Kenneth R. Tobin, 70.
 Mr. Ken Tomlinson and Guest, 20.
 Mr. Kenneth Towery, 9.
 Mr. and Mrs. Ken Towsey, 39.
 Mr. Patrick Tracey and Guest, 74.
 Mr. and Mrs. Mike Uhlman, 16.
 Mr. and Mrs. Robert Understein, 30.
 Mrs. James M. Umstadt, 31.
 Mrs. Freda Utley, 2.
 Mr. Wayne Valis, 45.
 Mr. Peter Van Rijen, 43.
 Mr. and Mrs. Rom Van Sickle, 48.
 Congressman Victor Veysey, 1.
 Mr. Ralph Vinovich, 19.
 Mr. Bruce Walker and Guest, 66.
 Congressman William Wampler, 41.
 Mr. and Mrs. Gordon F. Ward, 67.
 Mr. and Mrs. John Watkins, 17.
 Mr. James T. Watson, 62.
 Mr. William M. Watts, 74.
 General and Mrs. Wedemeyer, 43.
 Miss Elsa Wellepp, 57.
 Mr. and Mrs. Paul Weyrich, 14.
 Mrs. Electra Wheatley, 4.
 Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Whetstone, 7.
 Mr. Clifton White, 38.
 Miss Kathy Ann Wilker, 56.
 Mr. C. Dickerman Williams, 26.
 Mr. W. Rulon Williamson, 70.
 Mr. Glenn R. Wilson, 32.
 Dr. and Mrs. John Wilson, 56.
 Mr. Thomas S. Winter, Head.
 Mr. Philip B. Wisman and Guest, 56.
 Mr. Bruno Woernle, 57.
 Miss Womer, 62.
 Mr. and Mrs. Hastings Wyman, 9.
 Congressman and Mrs. Louis C. Wyman, 49.
 Mr. Robert V. Young, 66.
 Mr. and Mrs. Tom Ziebert, 66.
 Congressman Roger Zion, 28.

ON BUILDING LEADERS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, those of us in public life who are concerned with providing leadership for the future may be grateful to the many fine youth organizations in this country dedicated to developing sound leaders among tomorrow's citizens. One of the most outstanding groups devoted to this goal is the Midwest's own Future Farmers of America.

Speaking to the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation in his editorial column, Accent, Booth Wallentine pays tribute to FFA's ability to produce good leadership. I am inserting Mr. Wallentine's article in the RECORD today, during National Future Farmers of America Week:

ON BUILDING LEADERS

(By Booth Wallentine)

February 20-27 is National FFA Week. A time to honor 450,000 of the nation's finest young people.

The Future Farmers of America is organized in high school chapters in every state in the country. In Iowa there are more than 10,000 FFA members in 230 chapters. And membership is on the upswing.

FFA has many purposes, but they all point in one direction—building leaders. Only when you have worked closely with FFA programs can you fully appreciate what FFA can do for a young person.

But millions of Americans whose thoughts may be far from a group of blue-jacketed FFA members in a chapter meeting have enjoyed the fruits of the Future Farmer leadership development programs.

A case in point is Steve Zumbach, the Manchester, Iowa, student recently elected to head the 19,000 member student body at Iowa State University. Steve Zumbach recently completed a term of office as a regional vice president of the National Future Farmers of America. He had worked his way up from chapter officer, district and state president before his national office.

Steve's roots are deep in the soil on the farm where he was raised. But his nationwide travels, speaking engagements throughout the country and meetings with top level leaders, including the President, have expanded Steve Zumbach's horizons far beyond those of the average young man of his age.

The student leadership at Iowa State is in good hands for the coming year.

That's what FFA is all about. Taking young men—and now there are young women in the program too—and molding them into leaders who will give whatever community they belong to the benefit of the FFA motto:

Learning to do,
Doing to learn;
Earning to live,
Living to serve.

EGYPT, ROME, AND MARYLAND

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly voiced my great concern over the liberalization of our abortion laws. The legislature of my own State of Maryland is at the present time debating this issue. The Maryland House of Delegates will next week, in all probability, be voting on the abortion-on-demand bill.

It has come to my attention that a prominent Baptist minister, the Reverend Robert T. Woodworth, pastor of the Open Bible Tabernacle of Baltimore and producer of Open Bible Broadcasts, Inc., has done extensive research on the history of abortion.

Because of the tremendous importance of the impending abortion legislation, I would like to present Reverend Woodworth's statement, which he delivered to the Maryland State Legislature, for inclusion in the RECORD:

EGYPT, ROME, AND MARYLAND!

(Statement by the Reverend Robert T. Woodworth, Pastor of Open Bible Tabernacle, Baltimore, Md. 21214, and producer of Open Bible Broadcasts, Inc., before the Maryland State Legislature on the questions involved in liberalization of abortion, January 28, 1971)

Twice before in history innocent infants have been destroyed because of a maniac monarch, an oppressive government, and permissive people.

When Pharaoh feared the numerical increase of Israel, he ordered the Hebrew midwives to kill male babies. These brave women refused to obey the Egyptian ruler and spared

the sons of Israel, so Pharaoh ordered all male babies to be drowned. (Exodus 1) If this mad man's desires had prevailed, there would never have been a Moses, the world's greatest law-giver. But God intervened. Egypt was destroyed, and Moses became the world's greatest emancipator.

About thirteen centuries later another despot feared a threat to his throne and ordered the execution of all male infants in his kingdom. One brave mother fled from Palestine to Egypt to save her son from this legal lunacy, or Jesus might have been slaughtered in infancy instead of crucified at Calvary. Again God intervened and gave us the Savior of the world.

Without learning from history of Old or New Testament, today, twenty centuries later, there are government officials actually advocating a repetition of Pharaoh's follies and Herod's horror. The Bible says in both Old and New Testaments, "In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping and great mourning—Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted, because they are not." (Jeremiah 31:15 & Matthew 2:18)

Any government that can legalize the destruction of the innocent before birth will not hesitate to extend this sovereignty over the handicapped and mentally retarded, over aged and infirm, over political opponents, or anyone deemed to be mentally ill by their own standards based upon some "doctor" and one other person.

Killing the unborn intentionally is murder in first degree. In New York it is necessary to file a death certificate for each fetus removed by abortion no matter what the age of the unborn. This is an admission of the charge that to abort is to take a life. In a state where arguments are aired for abortion of capital punishment we now have some of the same people calling for leniency and extended life for convicted criminals guilty of horrible violence to the lives of the innocent unborn simply because they are unwanted by them! Such lunacy, such depravity!

But we need not go back to antiquity for the judgments of God on nations as devoid of moral consequences of infanticide, we need merely examine Sweden and Denmark or even New York to observe objectively this trend toward moral madness. New York City, abortion capital of the world, had over 2,000 abortions in its first month of liberalized laws permitting the butchery of babies conceived, but not allowed to be born because of the fear or hatred of the mother and the approval of her doctor. Three women died from this legal operation, but the defendants of infanticide quickly countered with, "We can tolerate three deaths per 100,000 patients." The same figure applies to Maryland where three deaths occurred in the past few months from these legal operations, and these unfortunate females were dismissed as inconsequential percentages.

But how are abortions performed? There are four common methods depending upon the stage of pregnancy. Here they are outlined by the Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life, Inc. (4804 Nicollet Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. 55409):

"To abort an early pregnancy the doctor inserts a tube through the opening of the womb and connects it to a suction apparatus. The vacuum is so powerful that the fetus is instantly broken up into a fluid mass of blood, tissue, and cartilage. It quickly passes through this tube and is collected in a bottle.

"In the curettage technique the doctor stretches or dilates the mouth of the womb to admit a forceps or curette. He then reaches in and drags or scrapes out the baby and afterbirth. The surgeon must work by touch alone, often cutting the baby into several pieces in order to get it out. The head may be crushed with the forceps to reduce its size for withdrawal. Bleeding is

profuse until the womb is scraped completely empty. The bits and pieces of the baby are then disposed of.

"Larger babies to be aborted may require an abdominal operation similar to a Caesarean section. The womb is cut open and the baby lifted out. It usually squirms and moves its arms and legs. It tries to breathe and may manage a feeble cry. If the lungs are too immature to function normally, it will soon stop moving, but frequently the heart continues to beat for several hours before it dies.

"The doctor can stick a large needle through the mother's belly wall and into the womb. After withdrawing some fluid, a strong, sterile, saltwater solution is injected—in effect pickling the baby alive. The baby may thrash about for a few moments, but soon it becomes perfectly still and dies. In about 24 hours labor will start and the already dead body is delivered. This technique can be used right up to the very end of a pregnancy."

But what about the father's rights? Are we to hold the father legally responsible for any offspring he may sire while we deny him any rights in determining the destiny of his own unborn child? Is a baby the sole progeny and property of the mother only? Such new and novel interpretation would mean the complete modification of many consonant laws regarding the rights and responsibilities of both fathers and mothers. How about the effect on our legal attitude toward accidental or unintentional abortions which date back to Anglo Saxon codes from ancient Bible laws? Indeed from these basic laws come our whole Western concept of the sanctity of life—that man is endowed by his Creator with the right to life and liberty, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men.

Conception is the life-originating miracle of God. Only God can create life by following his procreative laws. Only by God's laws for governing life can any life be taken morally. Isaiah the prophet asks, "Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord." (Isaiah 66:9)

It is significant that the advocates of abortion liberalization are also associated with other strange proposals, such as, sex education for children without moral restraints, free contraceptives for school girls, sex relations without marriage, family limitations to two offspring, freedom for pornography and perversions and a whole variety of related sins and sicknesses. God forbid that Maryland should become another Egypt or Rome. God forbid that any legislator or state executive should become another Pharaoh or Herod. In fact, God will forbid and intervene with judgments upon society and those who perpetrate these crimes against the innocent and transgressions of divine laws. Let us have a repeal of present permissiveness; not a liberalization of this extended depravity!

FREEDOM OF JEWS TO LEAVE SOVIET UNION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO Executive Council recently issued important statements on several topics of interest to Congress. One of these, reproduced below, concerns the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union who want to immigrate to Israel, the United

States, or other countries. Unfortunately, despite repeated appeals from an aroused world, Soviet leaders resist these pleas.

It seems unenlightened, as well as a betrayal of human dignity and decency, to persist in this attitude. A country's gates should be opened as widely as possible to both those wanting to enter or leave.

What does a country gain, even from its own viewpoint, to imprison its citizens who want nothing more than to find a new home elsewhere?

What man would lock others in his own house, against their will, and then wonder at the disfavor generated in the neighborhood?

The Soviet Union should heed commonsense and its own self-interest, as well as the pleas of those it imprisons for no crimes, by opening its gates to Jews who wish to leave.

I commend the AFL-CIO statement to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON FREEDOM OF JEWS TO LEAVE THE SOVIET UNION, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 19, 1971

The Executive Council urges U.S. government initiative for prompt U.N. action to assure compliance by all member states with the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. This Convention which has already been ratified by 46 nations, including the USSR and the Ukraine, provides for "the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his own country." (Part I, Article 5.) This right of freedom of exit is also embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights.

Such humanitarian initiative by the Administration is all the more urgent because of the unfortunate developments in the Soviet Union where citizens of Jewish origin are increasingly subject to intense and varied anti-Semitic harassments and persecution. With mounting frequency, this persecuted minority has, at great risk, courageously demanded in the Soviet Union as well as before the U.N. and world public opinion the right to emigrate from the USSR and go to Israel and other countries.

Only an aroused world opinion—stimulated by appropriate U.N. action and political and economic pressure by our own and other liberty-loving countries—could impress upon the Soviet Union the urgency of taking the shackles off the right of their Jewish minority to leave the country for a homeland open to their own free choice.

The Executive Council further appeals to free trade unions everywhere to rally public opinion and governmental support in their respective countries for having the USSR comply with the principles of the U.N. charter, the Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination and to remove the barriers to members of its Jewish minority exercising their right to leave the Soviet Union for Israel or other lands.

I AM OLD GLORY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr.

Clement A. Tamraz, has requested that I insert in the RECORD an essay which he has composed entitled "I Am Old Glory." I believe the essay captures the feeling so many of us experience when we look upon our Nation's flag.

I include the article "I Am Old Glory" as follows:

I AM OLD GLORY

(by Clement A. Tamraz, (M.A.))

The cynical ingrate who tramples on the generous endowments of his country, who burns and defiles the flag of the United States of America, should listen for just one moment what that flag has to say to him, to us...

I am Old Glory, conceived in dreams of Liberty. I was nurtured in the harrowed hopes of Freedom and, in 1777, adopted as the national Emblem of a new nation: bleeding, bent and bowed, yet fighting fiercely for survival and ordained to give all mankind the finest, the noblest concept of human dignity. I am Old Glory.

When they fired that memorable shot heard 'round the world, I was right there and I waved to him on that long and famous midnight ride. I was with the Green Mountain Boys and Minute Men; always by their side. At Valley Forge, covered with ice and sleet, I felt the fierce cold that froze the blood and stung the bone. I gave comfort to General Washington and his tired, sick and hungry Rabble in Arms. I am Old Glory.

At Fort McHenry, amid the rockets red glare and bombs bursting in air, by the dawn's early light I was there... yes, though torn and tattered and blood-spattered, I was still there. I am Old Glory.

Through the film of burning tears, mine eyes have seen the fiery wrath kindled by my own boys, the Blue and the Gray, and the psalms of sadness choked my aching heart and drowned my soul in bitter tears as I saw each one laid away, side by side, at Shiloh, Vicksburg and elsewhere. Though far from home, they were not alone, for I nestled them warmly to my bosom when they harkened to the Long Roll and slow Taps. I am Old Glory.

From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli, from the Barbary Coast to the Philippines, I was carried high and mighty by the United States Marine. I tramped through the blood-soaked fields of Belleau Woods, St. Mihiel, Argonne Forest, Chateau-Thierry, the Marne; and I never left my boys over there, even when it was over... over there. And while you kept the home-fires burning, my heart was yearning as I kept my desolate, bitter vigil over the lonely graves of those who gave their last full measures of devotion, and who'll stay forever to watch the poppies grow amid the crosses row on row in Flanders Field. May GOD damn my soul if I ever forsake them. I am Old Glory.

I was raised on Suribachi during the hell of Iwo Jima and waved farewell to the chaplains who went down with their ship. Mine eyes have seen the fields of gold in piece turned red in war, black when the firing cease and white forevermore. I give courage to the young, comfort to the old and devotion from the cradle to the grave, for I am on the side of God. I am the mantle of the unknown soldier... the Stars and Stripes Forever... I Am Old Glory.

NEW ENGLAND'S VA HOSPITALS EARN HIGH PRAISE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to

two current articles about Veterans' Administration hospitals written by Don Clark and John M. Langone, reporters for the Boston Herald Traveler. Recently there has been considerable criticism of specific VA hospitals and the VA medical care system. However, these interesting and carefully-researched articles accord highest praise to the VA hospital system and to five of New England's VA hospitals.

Since this represents the judgment of independent observers, having no connection with the Veterans' Administration, I believe the articles will be of special interest to Members of Congress.

Both articles include speculation on the relationship of VA hospitals to a future national health care program.

I found the articles most timely. I have been privileged to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs since my election to Congress in 1966. As a member of its Hospitals Subcommittee, I have inspected several of the hospitals cited in the articles and many other VA hospitals throughout the country. I will continue to inspect them to insure that American veterans continue to receive the finest quality medical care, and I find it most gratifying when responsible news media contribute to a greater public understanding of the needs and the accomplishments of the VA hospital system.

The articles, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, read as follows:

NEW ENGLAND HOSPITALS ARE TOP RATE

(By Don Clark)

A week-long tour of five Veterans Administration hospitals in New England indicates that, whatever the case may be elsewhere, veterans here receive a full range of high-grade medical care.

Sensitive to recent criticism of the VA system, the hospital directors granted—indeed, insisted!—on full access to every crevice of their institutions.

In addition, they encouraged conversations with anyone, staff or patient, who cared to voice an opinion.

These conversations, plus an inspection of scores of wards, clinics, special care units, laboratories, pharmacies, kitchens, laundries, and bathrooms, add up to high marks for VA facilities in New England.

The five hospitals visited were as follows:

The 795-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Northampton, headed by Dr. James L. Benepe.

The 188-bed general medical and surgical hospital and regional office at White River Jct., Vt., headed by Dr. Dawson Tyson.

The 188-bed general hospital and nursing home at Manchester, N.H., headed by John R. Rowan.

The 909-bed hospital and regional office at Togus, Me., which provides medical, surgical, psychiatric, and nursing home care, headed by John J. Jackson.

The 364-bed hospital at Providence, R.I., which also gives medical, surgical, and psychiatric care, headed by Dr. James E. Black.

Each hospital stands atop acres of scenic grounds, and several enjoy commanding views of the valleys and communities below.

With rare exceptions, the facilities were clean, bright, and pleasant. Filth, foul odors, or signs of neglect were not to be found.

Evidence of renovation, refurbishment, expansion, and new equipment was visible on every hand.

Timothy J. Harrington, a spry 94-year-old veteran of the Spanish-American War, had only praise for the care he gets in the spotless nursing home unit at Manchester.

Relaxing in a sunny day room with a

sweeping view of Merrimack Valley, Mr. Harrington said, "They treat me wonderful here, just wonderful. God bless 'em all!"

Noting the personal involvement of the nursing staff for the patients, John Rowan, Manchester VA director, said, "This hospital holds a prestigious place in the community, and our people consider it a prideful place to work."

"We have some custodians and kitchen staff, for example, who have been here 20 years and more, and they take personal pride in the care we give. We are able to attract a caliber of help that would be hard to recruit in a large city at the same wages."

Dr. William F. Heslin, chief of staff at Manchester, stressed, however, that what really matters is "quality of medical care."

"Physical surroundings and hotel-type service, such as the food and the beds, are important, of course," he said, "but a person can get magnificent medical care in an army tent. That's what we're in business for—to give good care."

"On that score," he added, "VA hospitals don't have to take a back seat to anyone."

The facts seem to support Dr. Heslin's enthusiasm.

The Providence hospital, for example, is the only place in that state with a 16-bed hemodialysis unit, providing the most advanced artificial kidney functions without cost for veterans who would literally die if such care were not available.

The Togus, Me., VA hospital pioneered in that state in the field of intensive coronary care units, and its program is now widely copied.

The White River Junction hospital in Vermont, which is already an indispensable part of the medical degree program of Dartmouth University, is blazing trails in training paramedical personnel with a hospital-university-medical society partnership called "Medex."

The White River Junction facility is also doing advanced research in the field of liver diseases and metabolic disturbances.

Nationally, the VA system has led the field in successful treatment of tuberculosis with drugs. It has also been responsible for most major advances in the care and rehabilitation of paraplegics, quadriplegics, and amputees during the last 25 years.

In addition, New England VA hospitals are leaders in giving continuing attention to a patient once the hospitalization period has ended.

John Rowan, of Manchester, said, "I think we are doing better than civilian hospitals in keeping pace with new expectations from patients. The community hospital treats a person for disease, and in most cases that's it. But we will not knowingly discharge a patient until we are reasonably sure he will have good care after he leaves us."

Most leaders of New England VA hospitals voice confidence that the VA system furnishes a sound model for any national health care program that might be passed into law.

John J. Jackson, director of the Togus facility, said, "If a national health plan comes, we would expect to take the lead in it."

Dr. Dawson Tyson, director of the White River Junction facility, said, "If government medicine arrives there could be no better model than the VA."

"The VA is the largest health care complex in the world with a background of many years of government control. It has made mistakes and it has corrected them. Its experience would be invaluable. I can't think of any medical enterprise to compare with it."

Dr. Heslin, chief of staff at Manchester, said, "What is being talked about in Washington is a system of prepaid health care. In effect, the VA has always done this. The payment our patients made was their military service."

John Rowan, director at Manchester, said, "One of the main things a national health plan would have to develop would be cost accounting. That is something the VA has been doing for years."

"We have a controlled system of delivering health care, as opposed to an entrepreneurial system. If we know our work load, that is our number of patients, we know what the care will cost."

Dr. James A. Black, director of the Providence hospital, said, "Go to any local hospital and the least expensive rate you will pay will be \$70 to \$75 per day, plus X-rays, oxygen, blood anesthetics, and fees for private physicians, special nurses, and intensive care, if any."

"Roughly, our costs for everything a patient needs, you name it, will run about \$55 per day. This is because we operate on a fixed-fee, non-profit basis."

John D. Bunker, assistant director of the Togus facility, said, "Perhaps our greatest success as a potential model for a national health plan has been our outpatient program whereby a veteran can go for care to his own private doctor, who in turn is paid by the VA on a fixed-fee basis."

Dr. Robert L. Ohler, chief of medicine at Togus, said, "The VA has demonstrated that you can have a large group of federally funded hospitals that provide high-grade care for a large section of the population."

"We run an efficient brand of socialized medicine. It's surprising how few problems arise in this type of program. What impresses me about this system from the standpoint of a doctor is what you can do and what equipment you can get and what programs you can get into depends entirely on yourself, even though you sometimes have to wait for the ponderous government machinery to work."

Dr. Ohler voiced doubt, however, that a VA style of socialized medicine could be applied to the entire population.

"You can't just multiply what we do by 10," he said, "primarily because the people who work in this system are here because they want to be. There are many doctors, however, who don't want anything to do with how we do things."

Dr. James Benepe, director of the Northampton facility, said, "I am not so much interested in the form that a health system takes as in the results it delivers. I am not certain that every hospital should emulate the VA system."

As an alternative, Dr. Benepe called for studies to ascertain what local, regional, and national health needs are and then for creation of systems designed to meet those needs.

"What we finally wind up with may not be anything like the VA," he said.

But Dr. Fernald C. Pitts, chief of staff at Providence hospital, said, "I believe our system can be multiplied any number of times. The point of the matter is that we have a centrally organized national health program that practices excellent medicine and could practice even better medicine with more money."

Dr. Pitts voiced enthusiasm for the incentives that the VA offers to attract and hold good doctors.

"When you compare figures accurately, benefit for benefit, our doctors do very well," he said. "Based on the amount of time they must work, our doctors receive roughly the same as a doctor in private practice."

"A private doctor," he said, "must pay his office staff, his assistants, his accountant, and his insurance. If he takes two weeks off, he has no earnings. It is also very difficult for a private doctor to limit his practice."

"Many come to us because they just start to wear out. Many are disenchanted with the taxes and expenses that go with the large sums of money."

"Our doctors are scheduled for 40 hours

a week, although they are technically on call at all times; they get 30 paid days of annual leave, 15 sick days, and authorized paid absence to attend two medical conferences each year. The Government also pays much of the cost of their health insurance and life insurance."

In short, the VA hospital system has moved a long way from its developmental phase of 1922 to 1946 when it was a closed system of bureaucratic medicine, with doctors on civil service.

Today, the VA is moving swiftly toward regional cooperative arrangements with other hospitals, medical schools, and research institutions in order to build a network of specialized facilities that can give complete health care to the veteran population of an entire geographic area.

If the experiment works—and every indication suggests that it will—the Veterans Administration system may soon emerge as the cornerstone of high caliber socialized medicine in the United States.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Feb. 8, 1971]

VAST SYSTEM SERVES ELIGIBLES AMONG 28 MILLION VETERANS; VA'S HOSPITALS ALIVE AND WELL—VERY WELL

VA SETS PACE IN RESEARCH, HEALTH CARE

(By John M. Langone)

The VA, the much-maligned but largest medical care system under centralized management in the United States today, has been likened to the paradox of the bumblebee:

Science says it can't fly—but somehow it does.

And, despite long grumbling at "this horrible experiment in socialized medicine," the Veterans Administration hospital system—called the Department of Medicine and Surgery—not only is still very much around and flying but it is making its presence felt in new and exciting ways.

Conversations with VA officials in Washington and throughout New England indicate that amid the exposures of some hospitals, the rhetoric about the medical crisis and all the discussions of national health insurance the VA is emerging as a model for solving national health care problems.

As a result, the VA is a powerful contender for a key spot in any national health program that might be enacted, particularly since the agency has been cooperating more and more with community hospitals and resources.

The role is a natural. Despite criticism, the VA has know-how, efficiency and an overall excellent record in the treatment of patients, training of professionals and the performance of research. The role is more fitting now that there is awareness of the concerns of the VA health system are the concerns of the rest of medicine.

Since its establishment in 1930, the VA has been quietly employing the same essentials of a successful system for delivering quality care that are now being put forth as revolutionary. And the new medical experts, in the eyes of many VA officials, have not yet found that the VA has been through it all.

But it is a role that has too often been neglected by the health planners, by many legislators who have written off the VA's role in a few sentences, by the anti-government involvement solo practitioners, and even by some veterans organizations which see, looming in the distance, the very real possibility that the VA health system may one day be treating non-veterans under a national program that would have no need to "care for him who shall have borne the battle" in a special way.

What is this sprawling system . . . this health arm of the government's "great gray agency" . . . this practitioner of good medicine that seems to have a knack for winding up always, like Boston City Hospital, on the ropes?

"The Mafia is better known than we are," one high VA official in Washington remarked somewhat ruefully to a recent visitor. "The average guy on the street thinks the VA hospitals are just some place where a bunch of old guys lie around spooning pabulum."

"The System," as it is referred to by Dr. Marc J. Musser, chief medical director of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery (DMS) is size with a capital S.

It is 166 hospitals, 63 nursing homes, 16 domiciles, six restoration centers and 202 outpatient clinics—all serving those eligible among a living veteran population that reached, as of June of last year, some 28 million. (Veterans and their families represent about 96.7 million persons, or about 48 percent of the total U.S. population.)

It is a daily inpatient census that averages 102,000, and about 6.1 million visits to the outpatient clinics.

It is 94 VA hospitals with direct, ongoing affiliation with 80 of the more than 100 approved and developing medical schools in the country, 75 schools of social work, 51 dental schools, 93 departments of psychology, and more than 300 universities, colleges and junior colleges providing courses in various health professions.

It is a staff of 6,000 fulltime and part-time physicians, 15,000 registered nurses and 15,000 licensed practical nurses and nursing assistants.

As a substantial health care provider and employer of health and medical personnel, the VA system is also a significant contributor to the reservoir of health service personnel.

This is reflected in the fact that the agency trains physicians filling 12 per cent of all available medical residency positions (in terms of individuals, 23 per cent of all residents received training in VA hospitals), 50 per cent of all medical school graduates, basic nursing students from 22 per cent of the country's nursing schools including 45 per cent of all baccalaureate programs.

Also, 20 per cent of all social work students in recognized schools, residents in 20 per cent of all approved dental residencies and interns in 33 per cent of all approved dental internships, 32 per cent of all dietetic interns, 20 per cent of all graduating clinical and counseling psychology trainees at the Ph. D. level and 25 per cent of all hospital pharmacy interns and residents.

VA submitted a budget for medical care for 1971 that was some \$160 million over the previous year. Later, President Nixon decided an additional \$50 million was needed and he approved a total request of \$1.752 billion, by far the most money ever requested. Congress ultimately approved a budget that was just \$105 million over the President's request, an increase of little over five per cent.

"Let's suppose the VA suddenly died," said Dr. Musser, a lay-it-on-the-line physician who feels strongly about the DMS' responsibilities in designing a system of health care for all Americans. "We pump millions into the economy of the Boston area. About 83 per cent of every dollar we spend is for personnel, and 99 per cent of that is spent locally."

"On the day the VA died, a third or half of the medical school classes at Boston wouldn't have any place to go, and they'd overcrowd the facilities. A large number of other health workers wouldn't have our labs for training."

"God knows how many patients, outpatients, indigents. There'd be tremendous impact on welfare programs. We just can't afford to wipe out 100,000 hospital beds."

"And it's not just beds. On the day the VA died, you'd be wiping out the biggest kidney dialysis system in the United States."

Dr. Musser commented on recent disclosures of problems in VA hospitals. "Our gains certainly outweigh our losses. Many

of the attacks had to do with the cleanliness of our hospitals, how long it took to get a glass of water, the physical plant and so on.

"But really, if you're sick I'd be most concerned that first, a prompt diagnosis is made and that right treatment is instituted. I don't care what else. If you don't have that you've had it."

"You can talk about color TVs, and ask if the place is like a country club, or is the coffee hot. How the hell essential is all that to the saving and the prolonging of life? It's unfortunate to draw conclusions that the quality of care is lousy. That's all too simple."

"Name me a system that isn't lacking. I reject the implication that our care is below high standard. I put the quality of care in VA hospitals in the upper 15 per cent of all the hospitals in the country. To say we don't have problems would be utterly ridiculous. Our hospitals aren't all palaces, though many are. But we have access to the best talent in the country and we use it."

"The system," with its maturity and experience, deals so effectively in the marketplace that equivalent services in VA have always remained substantially below the cost in the private sector.

"It is the system which establishes our leverage to obtain expensive equipment or scarce manpower and to use these resources in an economically defensible manner," says Dr. Musser. "Make no mistake. It is the system that commands the respect of our colleagues in the private sector. If this point is unclear, try dealing with a medical or dental association from the usual community hospital base."

"Try to set up a residency program or other teaching effort in a community hospital of the same bed capacity as your VA hospital, and take note of the fact that on its advisory committees and consultant roles, VA has secured the best brains in American medicine."

It is Dr. Musser's contention that all the necessary attributes for a successful health delivery system exist and are being exploited by the VA. He listed these as easy and convenient access to the system, a full spectrum of health resources so that care will be comprehensive, emphasis on treatment at the earliest stage of disease, maximum efficiency to assure economic advantages to both public and private consumers (one of the best ways to achieve this is to delegate the expensive duties of physicians to paramedics), and prepayment.

Last month, Dr. A. Wendell Musser, associate chief VA medical director, was in Boston for a seminar of the Harvard Center for Community Health and Medical Care. At the meeting, he outlined a key example of a VA effort—regionalization of medical care facilities.

In several parts of the country, VA hospitals already are working together in what is essentially a regional plan, solving problems that could not be handled by an individual hospital alone.

"We have found," Dr. Musser told the Harvard group, "that we can link together three, four, five adjacent hospitals into a regional complex. These hospitals differ. Some will be small, some large, some psychiatric, but each will be developed to its maximum potential. There will be at least one affiliated medical school or university health center hospital in each complex that is capable of providing a full array of the most sophisticated services."

Regionalization, one of the most useful working concepts of our time, is exceedingly difficult to implement in the private sector. "But, in the VA system this pattern of operation will be comparatively easy to establish," says Dr. Musser.

What of the VA's role in the event a national health program is instituted? And what of the possibility of the veterans hospitals treating non-veterans?

The first question is not easily answered in any definitive way. But what emerges from interviews in Washington and in the Boston area is that if it ever comes—and Dr. Krishan Kapur, chief of dental services at the modernized Boston VA Outpatient Clinic is one who believes "the stage is already set, it's coming"—the VA is ready, willing and able to participate.

One attribute of the DMS is its potential for expansion, and this could serve it well if national health moves in. When hurricane Camille hit the Gulf Coast, for instance, the VA hospitals in the southeast opened their doors to a considerable load of injured and displaced persons.

In 1966, the VA was braced to absorb an overload from Medicare which, as it turned out, didn't come. "It could even be ready to participate in universal health insurance if called upon," said Dr. Musser.

"Discussions about this are increasing, and there are speculations of possible relationships with the VA. The DMS must be ready to play in this league if called upon. Really, we could accommodate an insurance system. All we'd have to do is change our accounting system."

Dr. Francis B. Carroll, director of the 920-bed Boston VA Hospital, affiliated with Boston University and Tufts University Schools of Medicine, put it this way:

"It stands to reason that if the federal government is putting money out of pocket for Medicare and Medicaid and paying big bills for it, and we've got some hospital charging \$105 a day, ala carte for just the room, and here's a federal agency that does it all for \$55 a day, inclusive—how long do you think the people or the government are going to put up with that?"

"Should they have a national health plan when they already have the largest one fully staffed, not dependent on physicians in the community, ready-made and with built-in assets?"

Our deficiency is that we don't have women and children. If the law were changed, and we go those patients, this would not be a liability but a big blessing."

John J. Whalen, director of the 936-bed Bedford VA Hospital, a predominantly neuropsychiatric activity linked with Harvard, Tufts and BU, commented:

"With all the discussions of national health insurance we never hear the VA mentioned. We'll have a place in it if it comes."

"We have the knowhow, the ability to organize nationally. Maybe they'll consolidate the federal hospitals as they now stand, but if it comes we'll be ready for it. We'd be in an excellent position with our university affiliations, for preserving the high quality of care."

Another VA official in Boston had this to say: "There's no string of hospitals including the Public Health Service, and they're probably going out of business, tied as closely to medical schools as the VA."

"We feel they'll serve us well when national health comes into being. For one thing it won't come unless the medical schools endorse it. The VA hospitals under a national health system would be dual purpose institutions, not only treating veterans but non-vets, patients at large."

"The schools would love it. Let's face it, we're a workshop for them, and we don't kid ourselves that they'd probably try to take over the whole business if we'd let them."

"If the health system is nationalized maybe the VA would take over some of the voluntary hospitals that are having a bad time of it, annex them and run a dual hospital. A lot probably wouldn't survive without that kind of a union."

On the touchy subject of doing something special for veterans—the necessity for which might be wiped out if everyone were treated under a national health system—many administrators seemed to agree that a system

of priority would have to be established to pacify the veterans organizations. "If there's only one bed left in a VA hospital, for example," an administrator said, "and a vet and a non-vet apply, you give it to the vet."

There already is considerable interplay between the community and the VA hospital system. Apart from emergencies like hurricane Camille, and the affiliations with schools and universities, there are other examples of extra-VA links.

In Denver, for example, civilian hospitals send their organ transplant patients to the famed VA hospital, where Dr. Thomas E. Stark, one of the world's most respected surgeons, works.

Recent legislation has placed the Chief Medical Director as an ex officio member of the National Advisory Council of the Regional Medical Programs Service, and a VA representative on each of the Regional Advisory Groups of the established 55 Regional Medical Programs now in operation throughout the country. (With respect to that, one VA official remarked: "They never consulted us on RMP, because they weren't visionary enough. But they're doing it now.")

Under VA regulations, the organization "may join with non-VA hospitals in a cooperative effort to share the use of specialized medical resources." Primary emphasis in this program area is on outpatient diagnostic services and care, but inpatient care is not excluded.

One exciting and hitherto unpublished project involves what is meant to be a model rehabilitation center at the West Roxbury VA Hospital, a national facility that would treat patients for spinal cord injuries, for orthopedic problems and for cardiac ailments. (West Roxbury VA has three major services: spinal cord injury, with 132 beds; medicine and surgery, all well represented in the field of cardiovascular facilities, with both a cardiocatheterization lab and an open heart surgical program.)

The complexion of the hospital's patient population has changed as the facility experiences increased applications and admissions of Vietnam veterans, particularly with spinal cord injuries and orthopedic problems.

Both Dr. Musser and Corydon F. Heard, director of the West Roxbury Hospital, revealed that a team from Harvard Medical School was in Washington recently to discuss lending the school's support.

More interesting is the possibility that an additional unit would be built to handle non-veterans, the victims of increasing spinal cord injuries on the highways and in swimming accidents.

At the Brockton VA Hospital, a unique community - hospital - industry - rehabilitation program (CHIRP) is operated for mentally ill veterans, with the focus on real work. It involves light assembly jobs furnished by local industry for which patients are paid. Nearly 250 industries in New England and some outside states provide work to be done at the hospital.

The hospital's pioneer alcoholism unit also provides lectures and courses for clergymen, police and other interested groups.

"The day the VA had a big fence around it is gone," remarked Bedford VA's Whelan. "We've intensive programs here, and use community resources heavily. Middlesex Community College is on the grounds, and allied health personnel will be trained there."

His view was echoed by Clifford J. Choquette, administrative assistance to Dr. Ernest W. Kell, chief of staff: "The great role the VA will play in the future is the education and training of health care workers. We can really start here."

It stands to reason that the VA could not do its job properly if it existed in a vacuum.

In the area of psychiatric care, for instance, the families are as important as the patient.

"A man doesn't get sick all by himself," said Dr. Kell. "One has to consider the problem as a whole, and most often the problem lies in the family."

The Bedford VA Hospital is also one end of a television link with the MGH, a hookup known as teleconsultation. Health professionals exchange medical information immediately and directly across the 16 miles.

Dr. Musser summed it up this way: "Our enormous system of health insurance, Medicare, Medicaid and other welfare programs are rapidly moving the nation toward, if not a single system of health care, at least a single quality of service. Under such circumstances, no single entity within our society, private or public, can remain in autonomous isolation while the health needs of the nation are unfulfilled."

HEART TO LASER TO LIVER: VA's MAJOR SUCCESSES

A total of 5654 investigators participated in 5742 VA research projects during the last fiscal period.

This heavy research role of the VA has paid off in the past. Over the years, some of the big research accomplishments have been:

Treatment of TB has improved to the point that veterans hospitalized for the disease decreased from 17,000 in 1954 to less than 3000.

First successful implant of Pacemaker, achieved at Buffalo.

Pioneering work in lowering body temperature in connection with open heart surgery, done at Coral Gables.

World's first and only successful liver transplant, at Denver.

Development of gamma globulin "horse serum" to control body's rejection reaction in organ transplants.

Some of the earliest work in laser surgery, in progress since 1963 at West Roxbury, Pittsburgh and Washington.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, last week I talked with representatives of the press in Los Angeles regarding the present chaos being faced by the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. due to Rolls Royce's abrogation of its agreement to supply engines for the L-1011 jet airliner. The administration and Lockheed are now conferring with officials of both the British Government and Rolls Royce. If the British firm does not supply the engines, Lockheed faces bankruptcy. The following questions from various members of the press and my answers will, hopefully, answer some important questions concerning this situation:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON ROLLS ROYCE-LOCKHEED

Q. A great deal of confusion exists from all the speculations in the British press and the American press about the status of Lockheed's commercial airplane program, the L-1011, following the collapse of the Rolls Royce Company in England. What is your understanding of the status of this situation at this moment?

A. The Rolls Royce engine division is the developer and supplier of an engine called the RB. 211 and they have a contract to supply this engine to Lockheed for the L-1011, and indirectly for the airline customers

of the L-1011. When they went into a receivership they said they were unable financially to continue the development and production of this engine and therefore would have to abrogate their contract with Lockheed and the airlines. The apparent immediate reason given by Rolls Royce was the withdrawal by the British Government and by British banks from the assurances they had given last November that further financing of about \$150 million or more would be provided to Rolls to continue the engine development and to start work on production models. Additionally, they said that the cost of each engine would be about a quarter of a million dollars higher than the contract price they had agreed to at the beginning of the program. After the announcement that Rolls Royce would go into receivership, the British Government announced it would purchase the airplane engine part of Rolls Royce and would continue production of all Rolls Royce engines except the RB. 211. They denied any obligation to Lockheed or the U.S. airlines, but they did indicate that they might be willing to continue this engine if the U.S. Government or Lockheed or the airlines would put up the necessary money and would absolve them of any claims for damages resulting from late delivery of the engines.

Q. Has any way been found for the U.S. Government or U.S. companies to supply the needed money?

A. There does not appear to be any way for the U.S. Government to supply the money, even if it was proper for taxpayers money to be used in this way. As far as Lockheed and the airlines are concerned, they are in bad financial condition themselves currently due to a number of factors, and it would seem difficult, to say the least, for them to supply the money. Particularly, it would be difficult for them to supply the \$150 million working capital needed by Rolls Royce for the completion of the engine development and the beginning of production models. They might be able to absorb at least a substantial part of the increased production costs.

Q. What efforts are being made to resolve this situation?

A. I understand Lockheed's chairman, Dan Haughton, arrived in London this morning to meet with various Rolls Royce and British Government officials to determine if there is some practical way to continue production of the RB. 211 engine. Since the first announcements in London, British Government officials have softened their stand a great deal and have indicated they at least might be able to provide the \$150 million working capital, if Lockheed and the airlines could pick up the cost increase of the production engines. The British Government has been under great pressure inside the United Kingdom from the opposition party in Parliament—from British labor unions—and from the British news media to fulfill the commitments on the engine contract and to restore confidence in British trade relationships all over the world. Additionally, there have been efforts by various U.S. Government officials, including President Nixon and Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard, to encourage the British to stand by British commitments, in view of the series of catastrophes that would occur in the U.S. if the L-1011 project is cancelled.

Q. Are there no alternate engines manufactured in the U.S. which could be used to power the L-1011?

A. There are two alternate engines—one manufactured by General Electric for use in the McDonnell-Douglas DC-10, and the other manufactured by Pratt & Whitney for use on the Boeing 747. Both of these alternate engines are being analyzed by Lockheed engineers and I understand that both could be used. But it is probable that either of these engines—being somewhat different in

size and design from the RB. 211, would force a redesign of the L-1011 tail and therefore require a substantial delay and would substantially increase the cost of the airplane. Lockheed has not announced any delay or cost numbers for one of these alternate engines, but it seems likely that the best solution would be to continue the RB. 211, if satisfactory contract arrangements can be negotiated between Lockheed and the British Government.

Q. What will happen if the alternate engines are not feasible, and if a satisfactory contract cannot be negotiated for the continuance of the RB. 211?

A. It would force Lockheed to cancel the L-1011 and probably would force Lockheed into immediate bankruptcy. Of course, the cancellation would also cause about 30,000 workers in the U.S. to lose their jobs—15,000 at Lockheed and 15,000 or more at L-1011 subcontractors and suppliers. Additionally, the ripple effect probably would cause the bankruptcy of several other U.S. firms who are deeply involved with Lockheed as subcontractors and suppliers of the major systems that go into the airplane.

Q. Why would the cancellation of the L-1011 cause bankruptcy at Lockheed?

A. According to published reports, a consortium of 24 banks already has loaned \$350 million essentially for this project, and the airline customers have made advance payments to Lockheed of more than \$200 million. Of course Lockheed already has invested very large sums of its own in the L-1011, and the combined total of these investments obviously is somewhere in the high hundreds of millions of dollars. No income can be derived from the L-1011 until actual deliveries to the airlines are made, and therefore there would be no money to pay back the banks and to repay the advance payments from airlines. The losses thus incurred are far more than Lockheed's net worth and therefore a receivership for Lockheed would be the only possible result in order to provide all creditors and Lockheed stockholders with at least some proportionate share of a return on the loans and the investments.

Q. What would happen to other Lockheed programs, like the Poseidon missile, the Agena satellite, the C5A, the P-3 and S-3 for the Navy, the Cheyenne helicopter for the Army, the shipbuilding projects in Seattle, the electronics programs in New Jersey, and all the others?

A. No one knows for sure. Although I am not a lawyer, I understand that, under the terms of a bankruptcy, the trustees in receivership have as their first duty the protection of creditors and stockholders, and they have a wide latitude of powers to abrogate agreements—to sell off assets—and even to alter union agreements affecting employees. It is impossible to say what the trustees might decide about the continuance of the many Lockheed programs—and even the uncertainty that would occur while they were deciding what to do could in itself lead to chaotic conditions for both Lockheed employees and the thousands of Lockheed subcontractors and suppliers. Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard has said repeatedly that Lockheed bankruptcy is not a good solution from the U.S. Government's point of view, as it could seriously jeopardize Lockheed's ability to perform its vital defense contracts and its continuance as a supplier of products that are extremely important to the security of the U.S.

Q. What about the effects on unemployment and California's economy?

A. Most of the 15,000 Lockheed people who work on the 1011 are located in Los Angeles County—either at Burbank or Palmdale—but the 15,000 job holders in subcontractor and supplier plants are scattered all over the U.S. Additionally, the ripple effect of 30,000 people losing their jobs would seriously affect many other service businesses

in many states. On top of that, if a bankruptcy, or a series of bankruptcies were to occur, it could further affect many more thousands of employees at other Lockheed locations and at locations of Lockheed subcontractors and suppliers. It is impossible to calculate all of the disastrous effects this series of events would have on our nation's economy. The first and most obvious effect would be to turn these employees from the position of taxpayers instead to the position of having to be dependent on other taxpayers through welfare payments or other programs, such as unemployment insurance. This sort of economic effect is only the beginning—since it would trigger a backward economic cycle of very important proportions.

Q. With all these harmful effects that could occur from the Rolls Royce-Lockheed situation, what are you doing to help solve the problem?

A. First I wrote to Secretary of State Rogers asking that the look at the trade relationships between the British and the U.S., and in view of the importance of these relationships to the British, to indicate that their abrogation of this contract might be very harmful to the British in the long run due to the loss of credibility in the world trade markets. Next, I joined with three other California congressmen—the Chairman of our California Delegation, Chet Holifield; Congressman Al Smith of the Glendale area; and Congressman Jim Corman of the Van Nuys area—to petition President Nixon to use every possible influence available to him to encourage the British to stand by their commitments on the RB.211 engine. Then, just today, I have addressed a letter to Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard and to the House Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee asking that an investigation be made to determine if the U.S. Government should continue to buy other engine products from Rolls Royce in view of the unreliability that they have demonstrated in connection with the RB.211 contract. It seems to me that it is questionable whether we can afford to depend on Rolls Royce for engines for U.S. military use, and we ought to be looking for alternate ways of meeting our military requirements. In this way, too, we would indicate to the British that their abrogation of their commitments and responsibilities on the RB.211 would possibly cause severe consequences to them in their other trade relationships with the U.S.

Q. I have heard it said that the British action in seeking to renegotiate the RB. 211 for a higher price is, after all, the same approach Lockheed itself used in connection with the C5A contract and other U.S. military programs. Is there any truth to that?

A. I don't believe the two cases are at all similar. My understanding is that Lockheed had a series of legal claims against the U.S. Government based on differing legal interpretations of their contracts and Lockheed was merely attempting to press its legal claims. In the Rolls Royce case, there are no legal differences of opinion between Rolls Royce and Lockheed—and if there were any legal claims they would be by the customer, Lockheed, against the supplier, Rolls Royce, instead of the other way around.

Q. What do you think will be the ultimate outcome of these current negotiations?

A. Of course it is a bit too soon to say, but I believe the British people are at a very critical crossroad in their trade relationships all over the world. As we all know, that island kingdom is totally dependent on maintaining good trade relationships for its survival. If they remain adamant in going down the road toward abrogation of solemn commitments, they can destroy their credibility for a generation or more to come. Or, they can stand by their commitments and restore confidence throughout the world that

they will live up to their trade agreements. For their sake, as well as ours, I hope they decide to stand by their agreements.

NATIONAL GUARD CIVIL DISTURBANCE TRAINING

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have been joined by 29 of my colleagues in reintroducing legislation designed to insure that the National Guard is adequately trained and equipped to handle civil disturbances—be they in our cities or on our campuses.

The most recent Army civil disturbance plan—Garden plot—notes:

The normal reflex action of the well-trained combat soldier to sniper fire is to respond with an overwhelming mass of firepower.

But it goes on to warn that—

In a civil disturbance situation, this tactic endangers innocent people more than snipers.

The truth of this statement—as it applies to the far less well-trained National Guard—was made tragically clear on the Kent State campus last May 4 when four students were slain and 10 more wounded—many of whom were not even taking part in the demonstration.

As the President's Commission on Campus Unrest stated:

The firing of rifles into a crowd of students and the deaths that followed were unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable.

It is clear that the National Guard was ill equipped, in every sense of the word, to handle the situation.

The only thing that could possibly be more tragic than the events at Kent State would be for Congress not to respond positively by making sure that the guardsmen are well trained and equipped before they are sent onto our campuses or into our cities to quell disturbances in the future.

To date, the National Guard's primary duty has been to be ready to respond to its Federal mission; that is, to provide organized units of trained personnel with sufficient and suitable equipment to augment the Active Army and Air Force in time of war or national emergency. To achieve the necessary state of preparedness, guardsmen receive 5 to 6 months of active duty training, and then return to civilian life with a 5½-year commitment to meet one weekend per month as well as for 2 weeks "summer camp" each year.

Since National Guardsmen are civilian 90 percent of the time—for the most part, serving in managerial, professional, or technical positions—they are, understandably, not as well trained and disciplined as are Regular Army units. This is why the Army assumes that another several months training would be required after a call-up before the National Guard units could be committed to a battle.

But when local police forces are incapable of controlling disturbances in their State, the National Guard is called upon to act immediately—either as the State militia or, when federalized, as Federal troops. Thus, the National Guard has been federalized to protect students integrating southern schools and called to duty to meet the riots of 1967 and 1968, as well as to control civil disorders on campuses.

Between September 1967 and June 1970, the National Guard played almost no role in Southeast Asia. On the other hand, during the same period it assisted civil authorities in dealing with urban and campus disorders 221 times. Despite this clear evidence to the contrary, the National Guard Bureau continues to consider its duty to meet emergency breakdowns in State law and order as secondary to its combat support role. Thus, only 3 hours out of the 6-month active duty period are devoted to civil disturbance training—and not even this small amount of training was required prior to January of this year. The rest of the 6 months and the summer camp are devoted entirely to the National Guard's "primary" mission of support of the Regular Army in conventional combat situations.

The Pentagon's response to the rising tide of civil disorders has been sporadic and often shortsighted. In 1967, civil disturbance training was optional. After the 1967 riots, the Kerner Commission recommended increased and upgraded riot training for the Guard. The Pentagon responded by formulating requirements for 33 hours of civil disturbance training, but reduced the annually required time in 1968 to 16 hours of refresher training, with 8 additional hours for new recruits. Since the National Guard is instructed by the Continental Army commander to carry out this training between January and May, the National Guard cannot devote any of its prime training time—during the annual 2-week summer camp—to teaching the Guard how to cope with riots.

The Pentagon's response to the criticism of the Guard following Kent State has also been initially positive. A study group has been set up and, on the basis of its recommendations, the training of the Guard has improved. Not only is the Guard receiving 3 hours of civil disturbance training during basic, but all National Guard units will get an additional 8 hours of civil disorder training prior to May 1, 1971, and the junior officers will get 16 hours of leadership training. All of this is taking place where the Active Army is conducting a capability study of the Guard.

At the same time, 3 hours of training during the 6-month active duty period is woefully inadequate, and the additional 8 hours for everyone and 16 hours for the leaders is only a one-shot deal. Clearly, with a high yearly attrition rate in the National Guard—it was 27 percent last year—and a high potential for more disturbances in the country, we need a continuous, ongoing training program for the Guard.

In the area of equipment, the Army has

responded positively. Since Kent State, the National Guard has been equipped with face shields, protective body armor, and riot batons. In addition, research into, and development of, nonlethal weapons has speeded up.

At the same time, it is important to note that the Guard still lacks force options between riot batons and tear gas on the one hand and M-16 rifles on the other. We must make sure that the Guard has a wide arsenal of nonlethal weapons so that they will be capable of meeting all kinds of domestic difficulties with the minimum amount of force necessary—here it is important to remember that the Army's efforts after the 1967 disturbances failed to produce any new nonlethal weapons for the Guard.

In short, we must stop simply reacting to crises and plan ahead. It seems evident that we will continue our sporadic, reactive course so long as the National Guard Bureau and the Pentagon consider the Guard's role in civil disturbances as a stepchild of its role in support of the Active Army.

To remedy this problem, the bill I am introducing today recognizes the importance of the Guard's role in meeting civil disturbances.

It seeks to guarantee that the National Guard will be prepared to meet the constantly changing domestic conditions by creating the Commission on the Capability of the National Guard to Control Civil Disturbances.

The Commission members would be the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and three persons from the private sector who would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The legislation would also create the States Advisory Council on Civil Disturbances which would be composed of the National Guard adjutant generals and the chief law enforcement officials in each State, with the major objective of attaining coordinated State-National Guard plans in each State to more effectively cope with civil disorders.

The basic task of the Commission would be to establish minimum training, doctrine, and equipment standards for the National Guard with respect to its use in civil disorders. The bill, however, does prescribe three specific standards: First, National Guardsmen would be required to devote at least 1 week of their 6-month active duty training solely to civil disturbance training; second, each commissioned and noncommissioned officer would be required to participate in an officer training school patterned after the highly effective civil disturbance orientation course of the Army; and, third, no command to load and lock weapons may be issued before a National Guard unit is deployed at a disturbance unless there is immediate peril of life.

In addition, the Commission would be required to perform annual inspection of all National Guard units to make sure that the standards are being implemented and adhered to; to perform comprehensive reviews and critiques of the

operations of Guard units when used in civil disturbance control duty; and to report at least annually to Congress its findings on the capability of the Guard to perform its civil disturbance functions.

Any National Guard unit which was not found in conformity with the standards prescribed by the Commission would not be entitled to Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, protection against civil disturbances is our responsibility. The Constitution provides that the "United States shall guarantee every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against domestic violence." The Congress has assumed its responsibility in the past by providing for training and by paying 90 percent of the operating costs, virtually all the costs of the equipment and nearly half of the cost of the physical installations and facilities of the Guard.

As the distinguished former chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, L. Mendel Rivers, pointed out 4 years ago:

If these State militia forces do not have adequate equipment and they have not been adequately trained, it is incumbent upon us, because we have assumed this responsibility, to provide the equipment and training.

The objective of my bill is simply to make sure that the National Guard is adequately trained and equipped to handle civil disturbances—that it is capable of performing the delicate and demanding task of preserving domestic peace today, as well as in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration of this matter of utmost national importance.

Mr. Speaker, following is a list of those who have joined in introduction of this measure of utmost national importance:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Hugh L. Carey, Democrat, of New York.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.
John C. Culver, Democrat, of Iowa.
Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.
Marvin L. Esch, Republican, of Michigan.
Dante B. Fascell, Democrat, of Florida.
Donald M. Fraser, Democrat, of Minnesota.
James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Edith Green, Democrat, of Oregon.
Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.
Richard T. Hanna, Democrat, of California.
Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Floyd V. Hicks, Democrat, of Washington.
Joseph E. Karth, Democrat, of Minnesota.
Edward L. Koch, Democrat, of New York.
Robert L. Leggett, Democrat, of California.
Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat, of Hawaii.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat, of Illinois.
William S. Moorhead, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
John E. Moss, Democrat, of California.
Bertram L. Podell, Democrat, of New York.
Tom Rallsback, Republican, of Illinois.
Thomas M. Rees, Democrat, of California.
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Republican, of Michigan.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
William F. Ryan, Democrat, of New York.
Fernand St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Charles W. Sandman, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.
Louis Stokes, Democrat, of Ohio.

PITTSBURGH EDITOR TACKLES CONUNDRUM: "WHAT ARE WE DOING IN LAOS, DADDY?"

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, every evening on the nightly news, America is treated to one Government or military official after another telling how the United States really is not involved in the invasion of Laos.

We are not involved to the degree that U.S. helicopters, with American men, are being knocked out of the skies almost at will.

We are not involved to the degree that the President will not preclude an invasion of North Vietnam by the South Vietnamese Army, an invasion he knows cannot occur without heavy American assistance.

The duplicity and nitpicking explanations are too much even for those of us who are old hands at hearings Pentagonese.

Tom Hennessy, editor of a delightful weekly publication in Pittsburgh, the Forum, has written a column telling of the difficulties one might encounter explaining to a child what our Government is doing in Laos.

The mysteries and clouds that once surrounded how one explains to children the facts of life seem simple when compared to explaining American foreign policy in Indochina.

For the enjoyment and edification of my colleagues, I wish to introduce Mr. Hennessy's topical and humorous thoughts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TOM'S COLUMN

(By Tom Hennessy)

My son, Daniel, recently tripped to my side and said, "Dad, I'm confused about something. I wonder if you could explain it to me."

"Certainly, my young heir. What is it about sex that is confusing you?"

"It's not about sex. It's about Laos."

"Oh. Well, let's discuss it. What would you like to know, small prince?"

"Why have we invaded Laos?"

"You are confused, innocent lad. We haven't invaded Laos at all. The South Vietnamese have invaded Laos."

"Oh, you mean the South Vietnamese are piloting all our helicopters that are being shot down?"

"No, child of wonder. We're piloting our own helicopters."

"But I thought you said we aren't invading Laos."

"We aren't. We're just . . . well, helping out."

"Why are we helping out?"

"Because we want peace."

"If we want peace, why are we helping the South Vietnamese fight?"

"Because if we don't help them fight, we can never have peace."

"That doesn't make much sense. If we want peace, why don't we just stop fighting and leave?"

"Because that would be dishonorable."

"You mean it's more honorable to stay there and help kill people?"

"You don't understand. We're not really killing people in Laos because we aren't there."

"But you said before that we were piloting our own helicopters. Now how can you say we aren't really in Laos?"

"We aren't in Laos because the President and Melvin Laird and William Rogers say we aren't in Laos."

"Oh, there are no Americans in Laos?"

"That's right, my young brave. Thank heavens, you're beginning to understand."

"Then what about the CIA camp that we just bombed in Laos. Aren't the people in the CIA Americans?"

"No . . . I mean, yes."

"What are they doing in Laos?"

"Why don't you ask Walter Cronkite?"

"And why are we bombing our own people anyway?"

"Wouldn't you rather ask me something about sex?"

FOREIGN AID TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the charitable American people are forced to give billions of their hard-earned tax dollars to foreign countries as foreign aid and to international banking cartels for overseas financing. In most instances the only expected return is progress in the recipient country and friendship and cooperation toward our country.

Now, from New York City financial circles we learn that many of our foreign friends who always have their hands out for free or special reduced interest rate financing are sending their foreign money back to the United States. However, the foreign dollars do not come as foreign aid, but rather as investment capital to capture the high interest rate from the American people.

By the end of 1970, the Commerce Department reported that 491 foreign corporations had 766 subsidiaries or affiliates in this country. As if a warning to those of the dove flock who want domestic priorities at the sacrifice of industrial and scientific development and growth, the largest overseas investment commitment of 1969 was by a British company investing in the United States. English technological advancement, many will recall, has been stymied under the liberal Labor Party following World War II, to the financial detriment of that once-great nation.

Mr. S. Stanley Katz, Director of the Commerce Department's Office of International Investment, calls this new "foreign aid" to the United States "part of the growing internationalization of world production." He proceeds further in a report prepared for the Commission stating:

In this "one world economy" focus . . . designed to maximize total production and efficiency . . . impact may well be on a par with that of the industrial revolution.

While I most certainly am not opposed to foreign capital investments or foreign expertise entering our industrial fields—so long as they pay taxes as every citizen—I do question the continuation of public tax money being given

as foreign aid to these same nations to run their own economy at home.

I am also reminded of the 1969 World Bank Convention held in Washington, D.C., from which came various programs planning the control of internationalized capital so as to destroy nationalism via programs of internationalization of the world's tools of production, thereby making the industrialists and nations interdependent upon one another. In this regard see my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 21, page 28737, "World Bank Supported Mainly by U.S. Tax Dollars"; volume 115, part 21, page 29311, "World Bank Campaign"; volume 115, part 22, page 30521, "World Bank and Washington Too."

What connection does the influx of foreigners' "foreign aid" investments in the United States play with the President's new deficit fiscal policy and 9-percent anticipated increase in the GNP? Are U.S. taxpayers to face a greater national debt to assure that the foreigners get a handsome return on their investments?

Strange that the President's military generals are not as independent as his financial generals. The feud between the Treasury and the Fed continues to burn. Is it for real or what are they up to?

In the policy vernacular of the U.S. State Department, such a program is "in the best interests of the American people"—we give for nothing, they give for profit.

I insert three news clippings in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 25, 1971]

FOREIGN MONEY INVESTED HERE IN RECORD SUM

(By Jack Lefler)

NEW YORK.—Foreign countries poured a record amount of money into investments in American business in 1970.

Financial sources estimate the amount spent to establish or acquire U.S. subsidiaries at \$1.2 billion. The Commerce Department had reported the 1969 total was \$1 billion.

From its very beginning, the United States welcomed foreign capital for development of railroads, canals and natural resources.

In 1791, Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the treasury, said of foreign investment: "Instead of being viewed as a rival, it ought to be considered as a most valuable auxiliary."

The government still holds open the door to investors from abroad.

At the end of 1970 the total foreign investment here was estimated at \$13 billion. Despite the strong growth since the end of World War II, the sum remains small compared with the estimated \$70 billion value of direct American investment overseas.

REVERSE FLOW

"The excitement stirred abroad during the past two decades by the international expansion of U.S. industry has tended to distract attention from the presence in the United States of numerous firms affiliated with foreign parent companies," says Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

"The diversity of their output is illustrated by such well-known names as Shell, Massey-Ferguson, Dunlop and Lever Brothers. And not only are many foreign firms operating subsidiaries and joint ventures here, more are coming all the time—especially from Europe and Canada."

The Commerce Department reported at the end of 1970 that 491 foreign manufacturing

and petroleum companies had 766 subsidiaries or affiliates in this country.

The most prolific investors in American enterprises are concerns whose home bases are in England, Canada, West Germany, the Netherlands and France.

While entry of foreign companies into the U.S. industrial stream intensifies competition, American business sources say they prefer that to an increase of imports. That is because foreign-owned subsidiaries must operate under American tax rates and costs of labor and materials.

Another factor that mutes complaints is that U.S. corporations—particularly oil and chemical firms—are very active in many foreign countries.

"It may be a portent of things to come that the largest overseas investment commitment of 1969 was made not by a U.S. firm abroad but by a British company investing in the United States," Dr. James Leontides of the University of Pennsylvania wrote in the *Columbia Journal of World Business*.

This move involved the purchase by British Petroleum of certain assets from Atlantic Richfield and to the subsequent merger of those properties and other BP assets in the United States, including oil leases in Alaska, with Standard Oil of Ohio.

Within recent weeks one of Europe's largest photocopy machine manufacturers, Océan der Grinten N.V. of the Netherlands, entered the U.S. market by acquiring control of ICP, Inc., of Skokie, Ill.

West German and Swiss companies have shown a particular interest in acquiring or investing in American chemical and pharmaceutical concerns.

Among the more widely known U.S. subsidiaries of West German and Swiss firms in these industries are BASF Corp., American Hoechst Corp., Standard Chemical Products, Inc., Chemsalt, Inc., CIBA Corp., Geigy Chemical Corp. and Pluess-Stauffer.

Commerce Department figures for 1969—the latest available—show that major foreign investments in American industry were \$5.3 billion in petroleum, \$2.2 billion in insurance and \$1 billion in trade.

"The flow of investment capital to the United States may be viewed as part of the growing internationalization of world production," says S. Stanley Katz, director of the Commerce Department's Office of International Investment, in a report prepared for the Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy.

"In this 'one-world economy' focus, investment decisions and operations are designed to maximize total production and efficiency. This development is regarded by some observers as one whose ultimate impact may well be on a par with that of the Industrial Revolution."

FEAR CONDITIONS

While the welcome mat is made highly visible, many foreign firms are apprehensive about conditions and situations they might encounter in this country.

They are barred by the federal government from engaging in coastal or fresh water shipping, domestic radio communications and domestic air transport. Some states prohibit foreign ownership of land for mineral and agricultural operations and of deposit banks and insurance companies.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 26, 1971]

CONNALLY CRITICIZES FED'S MONEY POLICY

The cold war between White House economic planners and the Federal Reserve Board intensified yesterday when the new Secretary of the Treasury, John B. Connally, criticized the Fed's performance over the past five months.

"The 1.1 per cent increase in the money supply in January was not at all satisfac-

tory," Connally told the House Appropriations Committee.

"The average 3 per cent increase in the money supply since September also was not at all satisfactory," he said.

The argument stems from President Nixon's heavy reliance on the independent Reserve Board expanding the money supply rapidly enough to meet the administration target of a 9 per cent growth rate this year.

Arthur F. Burns, a presidential adviser before he became Fed chairman last year, has stoutly resisted such administration pressure, suggesting that stepping up the monetary growth rate would rekindle the fires of inflation.

Meanwhile, the specter of an outright confrontation between the White House and the Federal Reserve was raised yesterday at Joint Economic Committee hearings, where a majority of witnesses in recent days has claimed the administration itself must combine a more expansive fiscal policy with some form of incomes policy to reach its economic goals.

If the recovery should pick up speed, said Robert Lekachman of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, the following scenario is quite possible:

"An acceleration of price inflation, a reduction by the Federal Reserve in the rate at which it creates new money, and finally either a replay of the Treasury-Federal Reserve confrontations of the Truman era or a retreat by the White House from fiscal expansion. Either outcome is guaranteed to nip an emerging recovery long before it flowers."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1971]

BURNS REBUFFS NIXON ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Hobart Rowen)

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns yesterday bluntly and decisively rejected the Nixon administration's appeal for a faster expansion of money and credit as unnecessary and probably inflationary.

Moreover, although he said that "a real recovery" from recession may be under way, Burns told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress that the administration prediction of a 9 per cent surge in economic output this year might be "admirable" as a target, but "optimistic" as a forecast.

It was the first time that any high official had referred to 1970 as a year of "recession"; the official euphemism is "downturn."

In nearly three hours before the committee, which is examining the President's Economic Report, Burns made little attempt to disguise the sharp difference of opinion over policy for this year that has grown up between his board on the one hand, and Office of Management and Budget Director George P. Shultz and Economic Council Chairman Paul W. McCracken on the other.

He warned that the President was risking a crisis of confidence by failing to move ahead quickly enough to establish an "incomes policy" that would restrain inflationary wages and prices through direct government action.

"There is plenty of money around. What we (face) in this country is a shortage of confidence, not a shortage of money," the former counselor to the President said.

For the first time, Burns committed the entire seven-man Board of Governors to an "incomes policy." Heretofore, Burns and two or three other governors have separately urged Mr. Nixon to take more direct wage-price action.

Pat Burns opposed giving the President a two-year extension of standby powers to freeze prices and wages as "virtually dictatorial" authority. These powers are scheduled to expire next month.

He criticized as simplistic the projection

of OMB assistant Arthur B. Laffer that there is an instantaneous impact on Gross National Product due to a growth in the money supply.

The OMB has relied on an econometric "model" produced by Laffer as the basis for its optimistic forecast for the 1971 GNP.

One important underlying thrust of Burns' comments was the philosophic rejection of the "monetarist" theory of economics, fathered by University of Chicago economist Milton Friedman, and followed to a large degree by Shultz (and to a lesser extent by McCracken). This theory holds that the direction of the economy is almost wholly determined by changes in the supply of money, defined as the total of currency and checking accounts in banks.

"The Federal Reserve will not stand idly by and let the American economy stagnate for want of money and credit," Burns declared. "But we also intend to guard against the confusion, which sometimes exists even in intellectual circles, between a shortage of confidence to use abundantly available money and credit, on the one hand, and an actual shortage of money and credit, on the other."

Then he restated an assurance given the Joint Committee a year ago: "The Federal Reserve will not become the architects of a new wave of inflation."

The Fed's target for money supply growth, he implied, will continue to be in the 5 to 6 per cent range. "But one of the great virtues of monetary policy is flexibility," he added. Thus, if money "velocity" (its actual use) does not rise this year as expected, he left the way open for "relatively larger supplies of money and credit."

"The banks are full of money and looking for customers," Burns told Sen. —. "For a short time, we will continue (the present) policy and as the year goes by, we may be a little more restrictive or a little more stimulative."

The administration has wanted a firmer commitment. The OMB "model" calls for a steady 6 per cent growth, with no adjustment for seasonal variations. McCracken has said that depending on conditions, the money growth goal should be no less than 6 per cent, and as much as 9 per cent.

The burden of Burns' prepared testimony and answers to detailed questions by members of the committee was this:

Monetary policy, like fiscal policy, would have to remain stimulative "for a time"; but it would be foolish to focus on one element of monetary policy—such as the money supply—and to demand "an excessive rate of monetary expansion (which) could destroy our nation's chances of bringing about a gradual but lasting control over inflationary forces."

Obviously, referring to Shultz and Laffer, Burns said:

"You're getting some simplified economic thinking before this committee and the nation... (they say) the money machine would just grind out the GNP. The world isn't that simple. There is no single, one-to-one relationship between the money supply, however defined, and the rate of increase of (national) output."

Burns' statement was more restrained than many of his candid answers to committee questions. When pressed, he acknowledged that his "very discriminating" staff of economists thought the Nixon administration projection for a \$1,065 billion GNP in 1971 "very optimistic." The Fed Staff's number was "in a range" near the private forecast average of \$1,045 to \$1,050 billion, he indicated. (This was a jibe at the Economic Council, which this year departed from its usual conservative practice of naming a GNP forecast within a \$10 billion range, and instead picked the single \$1,065 billion number).

"Do you think there is a monetary policy," Committee Chairman _____ asked, which will assure us of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent real growth in output (the Nixon target) in 1971?"

Burns' cryptic response: "I know of no such monetary policy." Then he added with a smile: "But I'm not quarrelling with Secretary Shultz."

The grey-haired economist-turned-central banker took a moderately optimistic view of the economy's prospects for 1971, but it was designed to be more cautious than recent White House statements.

He said that confidence in financial markets had been restored with a growth of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in money supply (currency and checking accounts) and of 8 per cent in a broader definition that includes time deposits as well. Even though this pattern exceeded the historical average, he said it was justified by the "sluggish" condition of the economy.

The economy may be poised for recovery soon, but he took care to underline "weakness" in defense spending and business expansion. "Ultimately," he continued, "the shape of business conditions during 1971 will depend on what happens to spending in the largest sector of our economy—the consumer sector."

He predicted that interest rates later this year might be "somewhat lower than they are now—particularly on mortgages and longer-term securities." He expressed some concern about the adverse impact of this trend on the U.S. balance of payments—lower interest rates here encourage an outflow of capital seeking a better return—but implied that such considerations would not block the degree of monetary ease needed for recovery at home.

In response to questioning, Burns suggested that in addition to increasing import quotas to "provide a little more competition in commodity markets," Congress might want to consider postponement of the increase in the taxable base for Social Security purposes, which is now under consideration. In order to give an additional stimulation to consumer spending, Burns suggested, "I would not be inclined at this time to do that."

RULES COMMITTEE GRANTS SEPARATE VOTE ON REMOVAL OF THE $4\frac{1}{4}$ PERCENT CEILING

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1971

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee yesterday granted a rule on H.R. 4690 which will allow the Members of the House to work their will on the key question of high interest rates versus low interest rates.

The Rules Committee, in clearing the debt ceiling bill for floor action, safeguarded the rights of the Members to a separate vote on the proposal to allow \$10 billion of long-term Government obligations to be marketed without regard to the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling. The Rules Committee is to be commended for giving the House a separate vote on this issue.

As a result of the rule, I will offer an amendment to strike section 3 of H.R. 4690 which would allow the \$10 billion to be marketed without regard to the congressional ceiling. This may come to

the floor as early as next Wednesday, and I hope all Members interested in low interest rates will be on hand.

This House is well aware of the issue involved in the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling.

To summarize, let me state:

First. The removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling would drive up all interest rates in the economy and would signal the end of the trend toward lower interest rates.

Second. The removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling would lock in high interest rates on long-term Government bonds of 30, 40 or even 50 years. The Treasury today is able to market short-term issues at about $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent. Long-term Government bonds—according to existing market conditions—would cost the American taxpayer more than 6 percent interest—or $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 percent above the cost of short-term borrowings.

Third. Removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds would allow the Treasury Department to enter the long-term market in competition with local and State governments which are now entering the bond market after the long drought created by high interest and tight money. The entry of the Federal Government into the long-term market would drive up rates for municipalities all over the Nation and force many communities to forego badly-needed projects.

Fourth. The removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling would allow the Treasury Department to compete for long-term money with the homebuyer seeking 25- and 30-year mortgages.

Fifth. Removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling will discourage businesses from financing long-term projects and will worsen the already critical unemployment situation.

Sixth. Removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling will drive up interest rates for consumers, small businessmen, and farmers—for any group in need of long-term credit.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department's only defense for gouging the American taxpayer with higher interest bills on the national debt is that this would make for "good debt management." They argue that short-term borrowings make debt management difficult. The $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling is intended to make it difficult for any administration—for any Secretary of the Treasury—to lock in long-term borrowings at high interest rates. The $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling does indeed make it difficult for the Treasury Department to gouge the taxpayer.

When the Treasury Department can borrow at 3.5 percent in the short-term market, it makes no sense to require the taxpayer to pay 6 percent and more for long-term debt.

The $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling has a substantive effect on the cost of the Federal Government and on the level of interest rates generally, but it is also a broad symbol of low interest rates. It is the principal low interest policy of the Federal Government. It is also a mandate from the Congress for the debt managers—whether they be Republicans or Democrats—to hold down interest rates. The Congress has given up much of its

power and responsibility to the executive branch, but I hope they will not give up congressional control over the amount of interest that the American taxpayer is required to pay on the national debt. I do not think any of us were elected to abdicate our responsibility to the taxpayers in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is very, very simple. Removal of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling will start a new trend toward higher interest rates. The retention of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent ceiling will be a firm word from the Congress that interest rates are to be kept at the lowest possible level.

CONGRATULATIONS TO AYER

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of all Americans the centennial of the town of Ayer in Massachusetts. During the past 50 years Ayer has been known to hundreds of thousands of veterans who have spent some time at Fort Devens which is located in the town of Ayer.

I take pleasure in noting the fine editorial from the Fitchburg Sentinel published on February 18, 1971. This editorial presents very vividly the factual background of the town of Ayer which the editorial correctly describes as one of "the most unique communities in central New England." The entire Nation owes an incalculable debt to the people of the town of Ayer where during the frantic years of the Second World War, division after division of American men came and went through the facilities of Fort Devens.

I am certain that it is the desire of the people of the town of Ayer and of the entire Montachusett region that this New England town which has touched the lives of innumerable American men should continue to serve the national security of the United States by its dedication to the growth and improvement of all of the many services offered to the country by Fort Devens.

The editorial follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO AYER

The neighboring town of Ayer is probably among the most unique communities in Central New England. This is called to mind as the town opens its centennial celebration this week.

Ayer is a dramatic town, a community which has touched many area lives across the years principally because of its proximity to Fort Devens.

In fact, Ayer and Fort Devens are virtually synonymous to many people. Since the innocent days prior to World War One and through the years of turmoil since that time, Fort Devens has had great impact on this section of the nation as thousands of soldiers—training at Devens or awaiting orders—streamed into area towns and cities. Ayer has been host and landlord to more G.I.'s than any other community.

During the frantic and frenetic years of World War Two, when division after division came and went, Ayer's Main Street took on all the aspects of a boom town. This small

New England community became truly an All-American town. Men from all over the country walked its streets—the gentle accents of the Southerner and the mild tones of the Midwesterner mingled with the Yankee twang.

Yet, Ayer managed to retain its own individual character, a character that proved indomitable in times of hardship and disaster. One of these disasters was the \$4 million fire in 1961 which destroyed the Hartnett Tanning Company, the town's major industry. Ayer survived that blow somehow, a tribute to the tenacity of its people.

As it observes its 100th anniversary, the town displays its usual hustle and bustle. Plans are going ahead for a beautification program. The new Nashoba Community Hospital is nearing completion, a project that was aided by a town-wide fund drive. The hospital will serve not only Ayer but Groton, Shirley and other communities.

Ayer's school system is one of the finest in the East, again because of the town's unique character. For many years, Ayer has assumed the responsibility of teaching the children of Fort Devens soldiers. In return, the government has provided a good deal of financial assistance. The town used these funds to create an outstanding educational system.

As the town celebrates its centennial—an event that will be climaxed in June—we extend our congratulations to all of those who have contributed to its progress, through the good and bad times.

COMMUNIST ENCIRCLEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about National priorities. The so-called doves feel that the first priority should be given to the domestic problems of poverty, the big cities and pollution. The so-called hawks tend toward making national defense our No. 1 priority. While I agree we face many problems and must work for just solutions within the bounds of our Constitution, I maintain that our security as a nation must have first priority.

Self-preservation is a primary instinct and a basic principle in the perpetuation of a nation as well as in the security of an individual. Unless the integrity and sovereignty of our yet great country are preserved, we chance losing the marvelous free heritage and liberties secured by our Constitution, and we could become just another statistic in the long list of enslaved countries to fall under the yoke of tyrannical collectivist despots.

Communist plans for the conquest of our country call for the encirclement and infiltration of the United States. They have made unbelievable progress toward accomplishment of the destruction of the U.S. Constitution. In the encirclement process, we now have Canada to the north and Cuba and Chile to the south.

CANADA

You will recall the kidnap-murder last fall of a government official in Canada and the subsequent declaration of mar-

tial law which suspended the civil liberties of Canadians by their Premier Trudeau.

What Pierre Trudeau has pulled off in Canada, in my opinion, is a classic example of the Communist strategy of "pressure from below and pressure from above" which was used to impose a Communist dictatorship on Czechoslovakia. This strategy is described in detail in a small book called "And Not A Shot Is Fired" by Communist theoretician Jan Kozak. The idea is to use agitation at the bottom to justify centralization and takeover from the top. Communists or their dupes and fellow travelers, of course, direct the operation at both the bottom and the top.

The pressure from below in Canada has taken the form of a cry for "separatism"—the establishment of a nation composed of only French Canadians. One way the Communists are exploiting this issue is through the activities of the Quebec Liberation Front, which has been frequently identified as a Chinese Communist revolutionary group determined to overthrow the Canadian Government and establish a Communist people's Republic of Canada. The leaders of the FLQ have received extensive training in Communist Cuba, and their idols include Mao Tse-tung. It is the Communist FLQ which on October 18 murdered Quebec's Minister of Labor, Pierre LaPorte, and which held captive British Trade Commissioner James Cross. The kidnapped ransom demands included the release of convicted criminals and their safe passage to Cuba or Algeria—both Communist dictatorships.

As for the "pressure from above," we need to consider the background of Canada's Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I mention facts about his background primarily because the mass media has not, to my knowledge, brought them to the attention of the American public.

In 1945, Mr. Trudeau was a young radical enrolled at Harvard University. Two years later he enrolled under Marxist Harold Laski in the London School of Economics, a Fabian Socialist stronghold. In 1950, Trudeau was in Shanghai when the Communists gained control, and he became an avid admirer of Mao Tse-tung. In 1951, Trudeau made headlines in Quebec when he attended a conference in Moscow. Upon his return he was called a Communist by the newspapers of Ottawa and Quebec City because of his pro-Soviet articles.

In 1957, Trudeau helped found a Leftist publication called *Cite Libre*. Among his collaborators in this venture were three top Communists as well as a man who became the chief ideologist for the FLQ. A staunch supporter of Castro, Trudeau used his position as a professor at the University of Montreal to mobilize pro-Castro activity among the students there. So frenetic was he in his commitment to the Communists that in 1960, he was apprehended by the American Coast Guard off the coast of Key West, Fla., trying to paddle to Cuba in a canoe. Trudeau played an active role in a "Red peace" movement known as CAPRI and

for years he tried to create a United Front of all leftist elements in Quebec, being critical of even the Quebec section of the National Democratic Party Socialists for not being left enough.

When Lester Pearson, devotee of one world government, was elected as Prime Minister, one of his first appointments was that of Pierre Trudeau to be Canada's Minister of Justice. What sort of Minister of Justice the Marxist Professor Trudeau would make was indicated in the *Toronto Star* of April 25, 1967:

"Justice should," Trudeau stated, "be regarded more and more as a department planning for the society of tomorrow, not merely the government's legal advisers . . ."

Professor Trudeau, then Canada's Minister of Justice, was but faithfully echoing the Soviet textbooks which teach that law is not a framework for order rooted in a concept of inalienable individual rights, but is an instrument for Marxist revolution.

Mr. Trudeau wrote a chapter for a Socialist handbook entitled "Social Purpose for Canada." There he declared:

Indeed the experience of that superb strategist, Mao Tse-tung, might lead us to conclude that in a vast and heterogeneous country, the possibility of establishing socialist strongholds in certain regions is the very best thing.

So, last fall, Mr. Trudeau took advantage of the FLQ pressure from below to justify pressure from above. When the situation in Quebec became fraught with hysteria after the murder of Mr. Laporte, Premier Trudeau used it as an excuse to impose military law over the entire country of Canada, although the operations of the FLQ were confined almost exclusively to only the one Province of Quebec. This included censorship of news and the press in Canada. And to make sure that Communists around the world did not misunderstand his show of force against the Communist FLQ, Trudeau almost simultaneously announced that his Government would grant full diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime of his old friend Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. Trudeau has exploited the realities of the situation magnificently. The shock troops of the FLQ are safely in jail protected from the Canadian people and Trudeau's ideological friends of Red China have been extended diplomatic recognition without any backlash. To the contrary, Mr. Trudeau has been able to use the incident to catapult his popularity among the average Canadian as a strong advocate of law and order. Even those Canadians who do not relish the idea of having their civil liberties suspended go along under the assurances that it is a temporary measure and, after all, it has restored peace. Trudeau has thus gained for his left of center establishment all of his international aspirations plus the endorsement of popular support for his people.

CHILE

The most recent addition to the Communist encirclement of the United States to the south is Chile. The Communist world is exultant over the recent election of their Kerensky-like man—Salvador

Allende, even though he received only 36 percent of the popular vote. Allende is a self-professed Marxist—which is but doubletalk for being a Communist.

The Communist triumph in Chile resulted from the use of an old Communist tactic, the United Front. A leftist coalition of Socialists, Communists, and other radicals provided Allende the slight margin of victory.

Allende makes no secret of his admiration of Fidel Castro and the Communist regime in Cuba. Speaking after the elections, he said:

For the Cuban people who understand that every country has its reality and its own path, my respect and admiration. For their leaders, represented by Fidel Castro, my friendship as always. The people of Chile have taken a historic step forward, one which implies a great responsibility, and we must prove equal to it. Unwavering friend of Cuba, I remember its loyalty, its faithfulness to its principles, its Latin American dedication and its dignity.

No doubt, the Communist victory in Chile will result in a Cuba-Chile axis that will bisect South America.

CUBA

The situation in Cuba becomes more grave. In remarks entitled "Kissinger Credibility Gap—No Red Naval Base in Cuba," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1971, pages 3198-3200, I pointed out the serious threat to our national security posed by the Red naval base at Cienfuegos, Cuba. My information was obtained from testimony of the late Honorable Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, in 1970, U.S. Naval Intelligence, and information provided by Cubans themselves.

This information was known prior to a nationwide TV appearance of the President. In his TV discussion of Cuba and Soviet naval activities in that area, the Commander in Chief affirmed that the Russians had no naval base in Cuba. In his just delivered state of the world message, the President also retreated from the issue of a Red naval base in Cienfuegos by merely stating that the Soviet Union "attempted to expand its influence and its military presence."

Additional information which has come to my attention in the past few days further substantiates my previous remarks on the matter and further confirms the gravity of the menace of the Soviet military build-up in Cuba to the safety and security of our homeland.

It appears that with Canada, headed by a regime that is pro-Communist to the north and with the Chile-Cuba Red axis to the south, we in the United States are encircled by the forces of totalitarian communism, certain to be used as sanctuaries for stepped up psychological as well as military bases against our people.

I am indebted to Dr. Manolo J. Reyes, Latin American news director of station WTUJ in Miami, Fla., for providing me with detailed and recent facts regarding the Russian military activities in Cuba. I exhort, plead, and even beg that all of my colleagues who are concerned for the future of our constitutional Republic and for their children

as well as the children of their constituents and for all Americans and who desire to help restore freedom to Cuba to take time to read or reread first, the very significant speech entitled "The Soviet Threat" of the late Honorable Mendel Rivers, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of September 28, 1970, pages 33898-33902, and second, Dr. Manuel J. Reyes' statement and "White Paper on Soviet Military Buildup in Cuba."

I hope and trust that you are or will be as perturbed as I am over the seriousness of our military posture and the Cuban situation and that you will join with me in a program of positive action with regard to the Soviet threat just 90 miles distance from our country.

STRATEGY FOR PEACE THROUGH VICTORY

The first thing we can do is to provide for the common defense of our Nation as the Constitution requires us to do. We should consistently vote for measures, which in our judgment, would help servicemen, reservists, and veterans and strengthen the Armed Forces. I believe that when we send our young men to battle, the entire Nation should back them up to the hilt so that a victory might be achieved in the shortest time and with the minimum loss of lives.

The second thing we can do is to provide the truth to the American people about conditions in Cuba. The communications media must be encouraged to disseminate widely the facts of Dr. Reyes and other similar information. If anyone doubts these facts, let there be a national debate on the issue. In this way, Americans can know the truth, a knowledge of which is necessary for making wise decisions to take prudent action vital to our national security.

The third thing we can do is to assist Cubans in exile—not hinder them—in their struggle to throw off the Soviet tyrannical yoke so that they and their enslaved relatives and friends still in Cuba may live once again with human dignity in their homeland as free people.

What has happened to America that we will not stand up to the Soviet threat? Are we a nation of pusillanimous sheep or of valiant and courageous men? Are we still the land of the free and the home of the brave or have we become the land of the subdued and the home of the cowardly? Are we going to be blackmailed into selling our children into collectivistic bondage by the Soviet threat of a nuclear holocaust? The Russians have always backed down when their bluff was called. Are we going to continue allowing the State Department, which favored the Communist takeover of Cuba, to continue working against the best interests of America? Will we go on allowing our fighting men to die in no-win undeclared treaty wars under United Nations auspices or are we going to declare our wars and end them with victory? Are we going to keep on talking about the "peace" or are we going to end the war with a victory? Whoever heard of negotiating peace with Communists from a position of weakness?

If America continues to pursue the present policy of seeking to win a nebu-

lous "peace" through unending conflict instead of ending wars with victory, I fear for the future of our children for the issue is not peace or war but rather freedom or slavery.

The present Kissinger foreign policy calls for the avoidance of any direct confrontation with the Soviets while they enlarge their slave empire and strengthen their military posture to the point of having their missiles and nuclear submarines and guided missile cruisers in the Caribbean off our coasts. This while our Armed Forces are becoming weaker and more undisciplined through the encouraged policies of permissiveness by military leaders; while our great country is weakened from within by revolutionaries and a Supreme Court that seemingly can find constitutional rights only for the criminals, subversives, and atheists; and while pursuing a reckless fiscal policy of exorbitant deficit spending which can but lead to higher and higher inflation, more and more Government controls, and total national socialism.

The time has come for Americans who love liberty to stand up for America and for God and Constitution so as to start reducing the Soviet threat. The time has come for us to decide as a nation that the Soviets of Russia are our sworn adversary and not any mellowing ally as some would have us believe. The time has come for us to remake our world image from that of a weak-kneed giant to that of the strong and courageous defender of right, justice, and freedom which is our heritage. The time for positive action is here.

A good place to begin is right at home, with Cuba just 90 miles away.

I have introduced two measures to help restore Cuba as a free nation. My House Concurrent Resolution 65 would make it the sense of Congress that the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Organization. If this is done world attention will be called to the slave state that is today's Cuba. The other proposed legislation, House Joint Resolution 160, seeks to prevent subversion of the United States, Central and South America as proposed by Castro and to encourage—not hamper—Cubans in exile in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland.

A free Cuba will be in the best interest of our own national security and will be a giant step in the removal of the Communist encirclement of the United States.

In a recapitulation of a consideration of the priorities of national defense versus the many inflated domestic issues, I am reminded that as to many of the domestic programs there is a question as to their constitutionality; but there most certainly is a specific delegation of power from our people and from the States for Congress to "provide for the common defense."

Cuba must be a top priority for the peace and security of our people. Domestic programs will be of little help if we lose our country.

I earnestly exhort my colleagues to give early consideration and approval of my proposals. The matters of our national defense and the restoration of freedom to Cuba should be a top priority for our Nation's peace and security. Domestic programs will be of little help if we lose our country.

My two resolutions and Dr. Manolo Reyes' letter, statement, and "White Paper on Soviet Military Buildup in Cuba," and a newsclipping follow my remarks:

H. Con. Res. 65

(Mr. Rarick submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs)

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

H.J. Res. 160

Joint resolution to prevent the subversion of the United States and the American continents as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba under Castro, and for other purposes

Whereas there have been many suggestions and several resolutions as to the procedure necessary to stop Cuba's Fidel Castro from subverting the American continents; and

Whereas Fidel Castro's Communist regime has, by its actions, merited the condemnation of the Organization of American States as an aggressor nation; and

Whereas the Castro government at the Tri-Continental Conference declared, openly for all to know, its intent to overthrow every legally constituted government on the American continent, including that of these United States; and whereas, it has already put into practice the revolutionary plans of the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana in Bolivia, Venezuela, and Guatemala; and

Whereas the citizens people of Cuba, terrorized by huge arms buildup and foreign mercenary troops, cannot regain control of their government without outside help from the nearly one million fellow countrymen in exile; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of these United States not to have an aggressive dictatorship, supported by foreign arms and troops, menacing our people with atomic missiles pointed at our cities; and

Whereas it is in the peaceful interest of the United States Government, as well as a moral obligation to all Americans, to prevent Latin America and the United States from becoming battlefields for guerrilla warfare, as planned by Castro at the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana; and

Whereas it would be a waste of the American taxpayers' dollars to donate funds for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America while Castro is at liberty to organize, finance, and direct guerilla bands to attack and overthrow these same governments we are trying to help financially; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Government withdraw political recognition of Cuba's Communist government and thus encourage all Latin American countries to do likewise; and

That all governments who wish to participate in the Alliance for Progress must first withdraw political recognition of any Communist government in Cuba; and

That the United States State Department policy be clearly defined as no longer recognizing the Communist regime of Castro at Havana and that no reprisals will be taken against any Cuban in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland Cuba; and

That any nation doing business with Cuba's Communist aggressor government of Fidel Castro will be subjected to an embargo by the United States in equal amounts to that country's imports to the United States; and

That the United States Government will recognize no government in Cuba until a truly constitutional government is established by free elections participated in by all Cubans.

FEBRUARY 23, 1971.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

SR: I have been following very closely your statements at the United States Congress regarding the Cuban situation, the Russian military invasion of the island and the Cienfuegos Soviet Naval Base.

Last year on three different occasions, I testified before the U.S. Congress. On June 29th, before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate and on July 27th and November 19th, before the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House. On November 24th, I testified before the Security Council of the Organization of American States.

At the end of last year, I put together a White Paper with all the facts and figures I had on the Russian Military Build-Up in Cuba, which I am attaching. I am also sending you with this letter the latest report I made for my news program of today.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Cuba.

I take advantage of this opportunity to send to you the testimony of my highest consideration.

Respectfully,

MANOLO REYES,
Latin American News Director.

STATEMENT BY DR. MANOLO REYES

The fifth Russian fleet that visits Cuba arrived there in the middle of this month of February. The Red Radio of Havana informed that the fleet, composed of a submarine, a cruiser, an oiler and a sub tender, had arrived in Havana. Nothing farther away from the truth.

The Cuban Patriotic Resistance had just informed that only a Russian cruiser with guided missiles has arrived at the Port of Havana. According to the information received, the Russian cruiser entered the Port of Havana, Thursday, February 11th, at 8 o'clock in the morning. The cruiser has on its prow the number 553 painted in gray.

Outside the Port of Havana, two ships that seemed commercial ships, but were really for military support of the Russian cruiser, remained anchored. The cruiser anchored at the San Francisco Dock, Number 1, in Havana, near the "Templete". During the time the cruiser remained anchored, the crew did not leave the ship.

On Saturday, February 13th, at 11 o'clock in the morning, a car drove in front of the ship, it was a Lincoln Grand Ville, made in the United States and it is the property of the Russian Embassy in Havana. The Russian Ambassador in Havana, Nikolai Pavlovich Toluyevyef, and the Russian Military Attache, Amasov, came out from the car. Both went aboard the cruiser and remained there for several hours.

On Tuesday, February 16th, at two o'clock in the afternoon, the Russian cruiser left the

Port of Havana with a direction away from the Cuban coast. According to the report we have received, that ratifies that neither the oiler, the sub tender or the submarine were seen in Havana.

The Cuban Patriotic Resistance understands that the submarine, probably a nuclear one (and that the Pentagon made reference to a nuclear submarine in Cuban waters a few days ago), visited the Port of Mariel, that for some years now has been a port of Soviet military character, and through which many offensive weapons were introduced prior to the missile crisis of 1962.

The Soviet sub tender was seen near Cienfuegos, and according to the latest information received, it is believed that the Russian submarine has also been near Cienfuegos, where the Russians have already built a naval base. The sub tender is of the Ugra type, of 9 thousand tons, with a capacity to serve nuclear submarines. It is probable that the sub tender could be in Cienfuegos, near the metallic barges that have remained there since last September, and that are used to discharge water contaminated with a high level of radioactivity and that, later, must be dumped through the method of dispersion.

This Russian naval presence in the Caribbean has a double military and political value. If this situation is strengthened, Cuba could again be used as a point of blackmail and negotiation. But in the military aspect, the situation is extremely serious because of the increase in the Russian logistic military power in the Caribbean, besides constituting a threat to the peace and security of the American Continent and a constant check of the air and naval units in the Western Hemisphere.

"WHITE PAPER" ON SOVIET MILITARY BUILD-UP IN CUBA

(By Dr. Manuel J. Reyes)

INTRODUCTION

In the city of Miami, Dade County, State of Florida, on the 24th day of the month of December, 1970, I issue this "white paper" to denounce the Russian military invasion of Cuba, which is an evident, real and actual threat to the security of the Occidental Hemisphere. I also make this document public to render respect, homage and admiration to the Patriotic Cuban Resistance, whose members, risking their lives, have obtained and furnished the foregoing data. Yet, the Patriotic Cuban Resistance has advised that the noble Cuban population, who, out of idiosyncrasy, repels tyranny and slavery, is about to uprise in a violent explosion, even though there are many Russian soldiers and much military equipment in Cuba. The Cuban people hope that Cuba will not be a replica of Hungary and Czechoslovakia in the American Continent, which would only be a shame and an insult to the Occidental Hemisphere.

As per information obtained from the Patriotic Cuban Resistance, when this internal uprising takes place, many soldiers of Fidel Castro's red regime, will join the new Cuban liberators, regardless of who opposes this, and who dies for this . . . Cuba will be free with the coordinated efforts of all Cubans.

FACTS

Going into the essence of this "white paper", I hereby say that on August 7, 1962, I denounced for the first time over television in the United States, that, as per information received from the Patriotic Cuban Resistance, there were 5,000 uniformed Russian soldiers in the neighborhood of the Canimar River, in the province of Matanzas, Cuba. The information was negated in different spheres of the free world. Twelve weeks later, the 1962 October crisis took place, which

crisis not only made the world shake, but also put the world on the edge of a thermonuclear war.

Following the above, I hereby say that on April 28, 1969, I denounced for the first time in six (6) years, a new Russian military build-up in Cuba, taking into consideration the information furnished by the Patriotic Resistance in the island. The report was taken with a lot of skepticism; nevertheless, it was evident that the Russians were going to increase their military position in Cuba, after Fidel Castro publicly announced toward the end of 1968, his support of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. On July 26, 1969, three months after denouncing the new Russian military build-up in Cuba, a Russian naval fleet visited the island, establishing a precedent in the history of the American Continent. It was said that the fleet made a courtesy visit.

On November 9, of the same year, Marshal Grechko, Minister of Defense of the Soviet Union, arrived in Cuba, and even if it was then said that he was visiting the island to study the reasons for the dilapidation of the Russian arms and military equipment given to the communist troops of Castro, the Resistance informed that Grechko visited many Cuban caves.

On April 10, 1970, at the Kiwanis Club of Greater Miami, I denounced that Castro had tripled the number of missile boats which teledirected missiles, torpedo type, from surface to surface, with a 40-50 mile range.

In June 1970, the Intelligence Service of the United States Coastguard Service testified before the U.S. Senate's Subcommittee for Internal Security, of the assertions I previously made before Miami's Kiwanis, on April 10, 1970.

On May 14, 1970, a second Russian naval fleet went to Cuba and this time, as previously announced, went for supplies. The third Russian fleet went to Cuba on September 9th, causing official speculation that the Soviet Union was building a nuclear submarine base in Cienfuegos. We had already advised the American Congress of this fact, in public audience, before the Congressional Subcommittee for Inter-American Affairs, on July 27, 1970.

The fourth Russian fleet arrived in Cuba on December 7, 1970, thus, two Russian naval squadrons met in Cuba for the first time, since there were still Russian war ships which arrived there on September 9, 1970.

The aforementioned are the facts which initiate the foundation of this "white paper".

Following is the way in which the Russian military invasion in Cuba has been developing.

INCREASING SOVIET MILITARY BUILD-UP IN CUBA

I want to make it very clear that I am not a military expert, and I do not have the means to re-check on technical matters; I feel it is my duty that I should tell the facts, figures and evaluation. For many years I have been a catalyst of the Cuban situation. So, today, it is not only my voice addressing you, but the voice of the millions of Cubans who are suffering in the island from one end to another; the voice of many Cubans who are actually risking their lives, working in the underground and furnishing us information that otherwise we would not know, and the voices of many Cubans who have told the truth upon arriving in this land of freedom.

The foregoing history is the repetition of the case of the Trojan Horse in America. That horse, who externally was naive and beautiful and on the other hand, internally, had the military strength to destroy the opponents. To reaffirm the Trojan Horse's thesis, that if at this moment the radar screen of the United States projects an enemy aircraft carrier ready to attack, it would be immediately intercepted and attacked.

Cuba today is a natural aircraft carrier of the Soviet Union, consisting of 900 miles entrenched in the heart of this Hemisphere and 90 miles from the United States of America.

We are going to try to prove that the said enemy aircraft carrier has turned into the Trojan Horse who externally does not show the large military installation and tactical arms under Cuban soil, to avoid being detected through the means Democracy possesses.

Let us start by saying that Cuba is naturally rich in minerals, such as nickel, copper, chrome, cobalt, iron and manganese. Cuba has always been considered as the second country in America in iron reserve. The first one being Venezuela. Cuba is the 3rd country in the world in nickel, cobalt, chrome, and manganese. At times of World wars, Cuba has been considered as the first producer of some of the aforementioned minerals. Because of the aforementioned reasons, Cuba is considered an immense strategic minerals country.

Following the Cuba Trojan Horse's analysis, let us say that in 1960, a military study was initiated in Cuba, done by the Cuban speleologists and Soviet Military Personnel, who covered all the natural facilities of the island, including the keys, for the purpose of using these facilities for military ends, such as the storage of missiles, munitions, reserve weapons, fuel, communications, medicines, and different routes to go in and out. In this study, it was specially taken into consideration the many natural caves in Cuba.

In relations with the above, a micrometric study was made of the exact dimensions of the caves, its internal temperature, its humidity degree, internal and external communication, internal ventilation, water possibility, the relation of the caves in comparison to the surrounding vicinity and also, very especially, a study was made of those caves which merged with the rivers and the sea.

A similar study, as an example, was made on the boundaries of the Escambray Mountains in the Southern area of the "San Juan" river, where several roads were built for the transportation of weapons and ammunition in big trucks. Also, in this study, they measured the resistance of the superior cover of the cave in case of bombing.

As a result of the above study, many of these caves were reinforced with 6" wide concrete. In some cases, they were wider. Work of this nature, of military character, has been done in the "Sierra de los Organos" in the province of Pinar del Rio, in the "Sierra de Lupe", in Oriente Province, and in "Altura Central" in the Isle of Pines.

As evident proof as to show they have worked underground with military character, is as follows: Up until 1958, Cuba produced 4 million barrels of cement a year; each barrel was equivalent to four (4) sacs of cement and each sac weighed 130 lbs. There were four (4) cement factories in Cuba with the aforementioned annual production working eight (8) hours daily. All of this cement was used for civil construction and export, never for military aggressive purposes. When Fidel Castro stole power in Cuba, he absorbed all the cement production of the Island and from the usual eight (8) hours of daily work, he raised it to 20 daily hours. What has been the destiny of this cement which production was raised under Castro in Cuba 12 years ago, which has definitely not been used in urban or rural constructions for the people? There is only one answer to this question: That enormous quantities of cement has been used for the military underground constructions of the Soviet Union and the Castro regime in Cuba.

Reaffirming the character of the Cuban Trojan Horse, let us say that in 1963, great

shipments of hydraulic cement were sent from Belgium to Cuba and were unloaded at the Cienfuegos Bay. The hydraulic cement is not precisely for surface constructions, rather, this cement hardens at high speed, that is, in a humid area, for which it is understood that the hydraulic cement was used for underground constructions for the storage of missiles and weapons with high humidity coefficient. Let us say that in 1963, only in this occasion, more than 300 cement trucks were unloaded in Cienfuegos and took off to an unknown destiny. However, the Cuban underground has pointed out that said cement was taken to the missile base of "La Campana", in Manicaragua. This base is located in the farm formerly owned by a German-American by the last name of KOOP.

Following the example of the mineral riches in the caves, let us point out now that in the Isle of Pines there are natural marble caves. The resistance of the marble structure of the caves is tremendous against any external bombing. The Isle of Pines also possesses silicon and clay riches.

For all of the aforementioned reasons, and many others which will take quite some time to mention, Cuba today is underground perforated by the Soviet Union and the Castro regime in order to construct strategic underground military bases and so that the Soviet Union would be able to take out of Cuba the nickel, chrome, cobalt, copper and manganese.

Without fear to be in error, we can affirm that in Cuba there are actually more than 3,000 pre-built or natural caves, adapted by the Soviet Union and the Castro regime with strategic military goals. Cuba, today, is the Trojan Horse of America.

Continuing our analysis, let us see how the reds have used Cuba as the fertile ground for their offensive attack to the Continent and very specially to the United States of America.

We must analyze that the Castro regime has conventional military equipment and/or weapons to keep themselves in power and try to combat any internal revolt. However, there is a series of tactical arms in Cuba that undoubtedly exceeds the military conventional power of the regime and leads us to the belief that they will be used in open aggressions against the neighboring countries. The Soviets, supported by their red puppet Fidel Castro, are using Cuba in a possible preparation for a first strike attack against the United States of America, as a base to destroy the United States and as an export field of their revolution. At this time, it had been told that there is an average in Cuba of 20,000 to 30,000 Soviet soldiers, and are scattered in different military bases throughout the Cuban national territory.

We must bear in mind that on July 26, 1962, Russian military troops landed in Cuba, wearing weapons, at the Dubroc docks in the Province of Matanzas, using new pier inlet of "Mar y Melena" and at Mariel Bay, in Pinar del Rio province.

We all know that it was said that the Soviets had dismantled the missile bases after the October 1962 crisis, but, did the Soviet soldiers leave Cuba? Or are they still there? Have the dismantled bases been re-activated again? Did the Soviets really remove the missiles from Cuba? The Cuban people understand they did not, and I reaffirm it on behalf of the Cuban people.

As a final data in this general analysis, let us say that the Castro regime has been building different underground hospitals, among which are the "Sierra de Cristal", in Oriente province, near the Nipe and Levisa bays. Also, there is another underground hospital in "La Loma de San Vicente", on the road going from Santiago de Cuba to Guanatanamo. The underground hospitals are an

indication that the Castro regime, supported by the Soviets, could very well be getting ready for nuclear war.

Ninety percent (90%) of the fuel reserve in Cuba and many ammunition dumps, are underground, and in an unmerciful way, the others are being used under the schools. Exactly a year ago, there was a terrible explosion at the former Jesuit "Belen" school, which Fidel Castro attended as a youngster. . . . Eight girls were killed and more than 20 were injured. The Cuban resistance informed that the explosives placed in the school's basement caused the explosion. Let us say, as information, that the underground fuel tanks used by the regime in Cuba are 20 meters long and 3 meters wide, respectively. They are painted in black, have been imported from the Soviet Union, and are buried 4-5 meters deep.

All the Soviet system in Pinar del Rio is protected by a perispheric radar from the "Anafe" hill near Havana. This radar system perfectly covers the provinces of Pinar del Rio and Havana, and sweep the Northwest and Northeast sections. It took 3 years to build this perispheric radar system and this took place after the 1962 October crisis.

Following is a description by sequence of provinces of the military Soviet bases.

PINAR DEL RIO

Let us say that Pinar del Rio is one of the places where the Soviets, for years, have worked most. In Santa Lucia there is a sulphometals plant to produce acids used in the functioning of nuclear missiles. Two of the principal ports with military Soviet objectives are Mariel and Cabanas ports. Both naval installations are being exclusively worked by the Soviets and they do not let Cubans, even if they are soldiers, come near by. At the Cabanas port, they have established the bases of the Komar missile guided boats. This year, the number of these boats has been tripled to the approximate figure of 70. Said boats are provided with two missiles each, guided by radar and with a range of 40 to 50 miles. They are considered offensive weapons and the said missiles are surface to surface.

In "La Gobernadora" hills, near the Sierra de los Organos, there is a military base which has internal train rails. They used to be mines. All of its exterior gives a reddish impression.

At "La Gobernadora," also known as "Cangre" or "San Cristobal," and which is near the town of Candelaria, resides the General Russian Headquarters for the Western side of Cuba. The altitude of the said hills is approximately 1,870 feet. The Soviets have constructed a road from "El Cangre" which goes as far as "Cabanas" and "Mariel." They also have electric lines of 33,000 volts, all of which is very necessary for missiles. The same electric voltage system is the one used at the "Campana" base in Manicaragua, Las Villas province. Following the Pinar del Rio analysis, we can say that south of "Quebra Hacha", the Russians have constructed a residential district where no Cuban is allowed to live, that is, it is strictly for Russian officers. The residential district aforementioned is surrounded by wire fences. They have also built tunnel systems from "El Cangre", which leads to the exterior at Kilometer No. 4 of the road that joins Caya-jabo, with the town of Artemisa. During the first week of November 1970, a military Soviet convoy was detected at the Central road of Pinar del Rio, parting from "Las Mangas" village toward the Southwest. There was a jeep leading the convoy, with a chauffeur and a uniformed Soviet soldier, about 40-50 years old. It is presumed, as per the Cuban resistance, that this character was a General of the Soviet Army. This jeep was followed by two trucks with two benches each and each bench had 10 Soviet soldiers around 18-

25 years old, which makes a total of 100 soldiers, all wearing uniforms and military helmets.

HAVANA PROVINCE

Continuing our analysis, in the Province of Havana, there is a big Soviet military base in San Antonio de los Baños. The resistance reports that in this base there exists a 140-mile radar scope and from there, they can track the planes from Homestead Air Force base and Boca Chica in Key West. This base is one of the 3 top air bases of the Soviets in Cuba and it is the headquarters for the Soviet Migs 21. There are no Migs 21 in other air bases in Cuba. The bases are defended and protected by ground to air missiles SAM-2.

There is also an executive radar system in Havana, at the former Commodore Hotel, in the middle of a Russian neighborhood, as is the Reparto Miramar (residential district). The SAM missile system initiates in the hills of Averhoff in the Havana-Batabano highway and closes in Managua-Dayanguas. In Campo Florido, Havana province, there is a SAM missile base camouflaged with an alleged pacific farm known as "Camilo Cienfuegos" and since 1962, in its underground, the Cuban resistance believe the Russians have hidden the medium missiles which never left Cuba.

At "Las Caberas", there is a Russian military complex to which Cubans have no access. In this military complex, there is a guerrilla training camp for foreigners and the Russians are in charge of this training. One of the principal Soviet bases in Havana is precisely at the Managua camp in which neighborhood they have been perforating the nearby hills. The Cuban resistance indicates that in this place, there probably is one nuclear reactor, even though Castro's regime maintains that the same is for peaceful ends. Apparently, the nuclear reactor arrived in Cuba in 1968, and it is not known so far of any indication that this is for pacific ends.

The Cuban Commission of Nuclear Energy resides in Managua, directed by Luis Larra-goitia; different electrical power lines have been built from Mariel, Havana and Matanzas, to feed the nuclear reactor in Managua. It is calculated that over a thousand Russian soldiers are in Managua and Santiago de las Vegas.

MATANZAS PROVINCE

The Province of Matanzas, the most important point is the so called "La Laguna del Tesoro". For many years, the Castro Regime has been investing millions of dollars in construction equipment and in different buildings which he said to be of tourist nature, but since the beginning to this date, the "Laguna del Tesoro" has been totally closed to the public and only military personnel, Soviet and Castroist, is within this zone. Therefore, we presume there is a base of military nature.

LAS VILLAS PROVINCE

In Las Villas Province, there is another big Soviet base between Santa Clara city and Calabazar, at a place known as "Malezas". In this base only, Soviet Migs 17 and 91 are found. The base has an anti-aerial defense system and an artillery made up by multiple machine guns as well as a duplex cannon known as "KAR-30", against low range flights. This base, as well as that of San Antonio de los Baños, has underground hangars with special elevators to bring to the ramps the Soviet Mig fighters.

Also, in Las Villas can be found the so-called missile base of Remedios, better known as "La Puntilla" or "Bartolome" base, where they had ICBM's during the October 1962 missile crisis. In the Escambray, the Soviets recently built a road from Guira de Miranda to the Loma de los Vientos. Nobody knows what they have in these hills, but it is known

that only Soviet personnel works there, and that they have transported lead units.

CAMAGUEY PROVINCE

In Nuevitas, they are building a big cement factory and one of electrical power. At the Camaguey airport, the Soviets have prepared additional access strips using for this, not the airport itself, but the highway which goes from Camaguey to Nuevitas. They have taken out the islands in the middle of the road, the palm trees and they have strengthened the pavement on the road. They have also made it possible that this highway at a given time, can be converted into a landing strip.

In the island of Turiguano, in the middle of a swamp, there is a hill 385 feet high and on one of the hillsides, the Russians built tunnels and stored rockets. Eye witnesses have indicated that said rockets are moved on train rails. Two steel doors close the entrance of the tunnel. The exterior of the cave is covered (camouflaged) with grass and trees.

All the keys of the Bahamas canal are fortified by the Soviets. Its naval strategic value is enormous, since from that place they can control the traffic from Panama and South America, through Malsi. This position does not allow them to use submarines.

ORIENTE PROVINCE

Surrounding the U.S. Naval Base of Guantanamo, the Soviets and the Castro regime, have a military outfit known as "Batallon Fronterizo" (Frontier Battalion). Said battalion possesses a missile system for their own protection. They also have armored units of tactical fire. Around the "Gran Piedra" hill, the Soviets have built several underground installations, and it is unknown what the Soviets have stored therein.

Another two points of great military strategy in the Province of Oriente, are as follows:

1) The air force base of Holguin city, considered as the largest in Cuba, and in which there are only Migs 15 and 17. In the outskirts of Holguin, they have built a residential section known as "Lenin", wherein only Russian military personnel live. The hangars of this air force base, as well as those of San Antonio de los Baños and Las Villas, are underground.

2) The military base of "Punta de Mula" or "Punta Lucrecia" in the city of Banes, is considered a first-class base and has a 10-mile radius. In its area, the Russians have built a Naval Base for the KRONSTADT and KOMAR boats. Some years ago, Russian submarines were sighted in their vicinities, making military maneuvers. These bases are near the mines that are producing copper and cobalt and which production is being exported from the Nipe bay to the Soviet Union.

Let us point out that the support of the Soviet underground defense in Oriente Province is in the underground system of San Vicente hill near the Boniato mountain; the other support is in "La Sierra de Cristal" near Nipe bay. Precisely, there is a zone in Nipe bay, absolutely secret where nobody has access.

The underground has also reported that in the event of a possible overthrow of Fidel Castro, the communists have designated Oriente province like the main military point of resistance.

I can inform that lately, the Castro regime, assisted by the Soviets, has been conducting warfare games, using anti-personnel gases.

All the military personnel in Cuba has anti-gas masks.

As an evidence that supports this denunciation, let us say that in the middle of 1967, there was a leak of one of the gas tanks in that location and the accident provoked the

poisoning of more than 80 persons, including military personnel and civilians. These people were assisted in two hospitals. One is known as the Policlínico de Manicaragua, and the other one the Santa Clara Hospital.

CIENFUEGOS

The Bay of Cienfuegos is in the southern part of Cuba, in Las Villas Province. It is approximately six miles wide.

On July 27th of this year, I said before the Congress of the United States, and now I reaffirm, that in some place, somewhere in the Caribbean, there is a permanent Soviet Naval squadron, headed by a nuclear submarine. The chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Hon. Dante Fascell, asked me, and it is on page 179 of the Congressional record, where I thought it was based, and according to the information I have from underground sources, I said, either Cienfuegos or Havana.

In April 1963, the regime began to show interest in Cienfuegos, and said that they were making a shipyard, in Cienfuegos City near the port industrial area.

In that year, it was reported that in the shipyard the Castro regime was building ships. Actually, the Castro regime said that the yard was only for embarking sugar.

In 1967, the yard was completed at a cost of 8 million dollars and not a single sack of sugar came out of that yard. Then after a period of time, in 1970, we began to hear about the activity in Cienfuegos City, in Cienfuegos Bay, and especially near Cayo Alcatraz.

Cayo Alcatraz is about five blocks long and about two blocks wide.

From the city of Cienfuegos, in a normal day, Cayo Alcatraz cannot be seen.

Right now, at night, the city of Cienfuegos is under a tremendous shortage of electricity as well as the civilian population of Cuba.

So, during the blackouts of the City of Cienfuegos, at night, floodlights can be seen in the horizon. Cayo Alcatraz cannot be seen, but the lights there prove that people are working on it.

Right in front of Cayo Alcatraz, there is a place called La Milpa. All the Cuban fishermen of La Milpa and the surrounding areas have been ordered out. The place now is a military zone.

An underwater net was put in Cayo Alcatraz and also at the entrance of Cienfuegos Bay.

The entrance is under surveillance of Russian guards. Several months ago, a huge Russian spy ship entered Cienfuegos Bay and stayed there for several weeks. Later on, it left.

On this month of December, the Russian spy ship has returned and it has been anchored in a spot between Cayo Alcatraz and Cayo Ocampo. The ship has been fixed with four motors.

On the second part of this year in Cienfuegos city, Soviet sailors have been seen walking the streets wearing full uniform. That uniform is white and light blue.

The Russian sailors were transported by six British Leyland Buses. They were taken back and forth from Cienfuegos city to near-by Cayo Alcatraz.

Three-quarters of Cienfuegos Bay have been banned to Cuban people and are operated by Russian personnel. There is a big pipe line from the bottom of Cayo Alcatraz to Cienfuegos city. In Cayo Alcatraz, the Russians have established large warehouses for military storage, also a powerful radio station, and they have put a naval headquarters there.

Around the middle of December, two huge TU 95 Bear planes from the Soviet Union landed in Havana. Both planes were kept in

a secret place at Havana International Airport, in Rancho Boyeros.

Nevertheless, the Cuban underground reported that one of these big military planes, capable of transporting missiles or nuclear weapons, had a number 38 on it.

On those planes, two Soviet Admirals came into Cuba. Later on, the Russian admirals were seen in Cienfuegos city at Punta Gorda. They took a boat and with three Russian civilian engineers went to Cayo Alcatraz on several occasions.

In the vicinity of Punta Gorda, one of Fidel Castro's aides named Cella Sanchez, has established a military complex for Russian officers. They have two bars and Cuban maids with servant uniforms. The place is guarded by dogs, and barbed wires. Each day, the militiamen have to bring gallons of milk for the dogs, meanwhile the Cuban people are not allowed to drink it.

Near the inlet of Las Calabazas:

The Russians have built an eight lane road toward the Escambray Mountains. No civilians are allowed on that road. In the Escambray Mountains, there is a place called the Hill of the Winds (Loma de los Vientos), where the Russians have been working for almost eight months. No Cubans are allowed in that vicinity. The underground reported that lead unit ingots have gone into the Hill of the Winds.

Maybe, the largest barge in the world, has been in Cienfuegos Bay in this month of December. The Russians own it and inside there are 303 Russian sailors. In Cienfuegos Bay, there have been two large Russian barges. In September, the barges left Cienfuegos Bay and went into El Mariel Port, in Pinar del Rio Province, on the northern part of Cuba. Mariel is the number one port of the Soviet Union since 1961-1962, and before the Cuban missile crisis most of the offensive weapons were introduced in Cuba through El Mariel Port. Either the barges were carrying something and left Cienfuegos Bay to go to El Mariel and leave their cargo there, or they were empty and went to El Mariel, picked up something there and came back to Cienfuegos.

The Cuban underground believes the second theory. A Russian nuclear submarine was seen during the period of September 12-20 of this year; first, near Punta de Ladrillos in the western part of Cienfuegos Bay, and side by side with two other regular Russian submarines at Cayo Loco, the former Cuban Navy headquarters.

The previous report of the nuclear submarine in Cienfuegos Bay was sent by the Cuban underground and later on, confirmed by an eyewitness arriving in the United States.

In evaluation of Cayo Alcatraz, it can be said that the place is for maintenance and supplying of the regular and nuclear submarines of the Soviet Union. The nuclear submarines need medicines, food, replacement of crews and rechecking of their missiles. To make the rechecking of the missiles, the nuclear sub needs calm waters like the Cienfuegos Bay, because the missiles are taken out or put through the holes, and a wavy sea can damage or trigger the missiles.

So, Cayo Alcatraz is of a great logistic and military value to the Russians. Plus, Cayo Alcatraz is the motor nerve, is the center of a large military naval complex of the Soviet Union in the southern part of Cuba. Part of that naval complex is Cayo Largo, 64 miles south-southwest of Cienfuegos. Since 1961-62, Cayo Largo has been taken over by the Russians. No Cuban fishermen are allowed to go near Cayo Largo. At the western part of Cayo Largo, the Russians built a big pier plus a big air strip. And in the surface of Cayo Largo, the Russians also constructed huge buildings, of irregular forms. One of

them is five floors high, with elevators. In the eastern part of the key, there is a lot of running water. And on the southern part of Cayo Largo, there is a wide beach. Close to the beach, the depth of one, two or more thousand feet.

Part of the naval complex is Isle of Pines. The capital is the city of Nueva Gerona. And the island is almost divided in two by a big swamp. In the bay of Sigüanea, west of the Isle of Pines, the Soviet Union established the base of the Comsomol Boat with Komar Missiles. These missiles have a distance capability of 40-50 miles and the range of the boat is about 100 miles.

Little by little, all the civilians on the northern part of the Isle of Pines, have been drained out toward different provinces of Cuba. In the southern part of the island, there were a lot of lumbermen and fishermen, particularly from Great Cayman. They also have been taken out. In 1967, more than five thousand Cuban political prisoners were taken out of the Isle of Pines, because they saw too much. And they were spread through other political prisons in Cuba.

Two miles from the Bay of Sigüanea, there are hills called Altura Central. The Russians have been working putting mysterious military equipment inside those hills. Three-quarters of the Isle of Pines are in the hands of Russian military personnel.

I reaffirm that the puzzle has been put together. Many times in the past, since April 23, 1969, I reported that different Russian convoys have been seen either in Pinar del Rio, Havana or Matanzas Provinces heading toward south. These convoys have been seen without Castro soldiers. . . . Just Russian soldiers!

The solution of the puzzle is this:

The convoys have gone to Surgidero de Batabano, a Cuban port in the southern part of Havana. And from there, Russian soldiers and all kinds of military equipment have been shipped to Isle of Pines or Cayo Largo. All of this leads us to believe that there is a large naval military complex of the Soviet Union in the southern part of Cuba with an operational base on Cayo Largo . . . an offensive for surveillance in Isle of Pines and the headquarters at Cayo Alcatraz in Cienfuegos Bay. All of this challenging Guantanamo Naval Base.

The Caribbean . . . which often has been called the Mediterranean of the western hemisphere, has been always protected by the surrounding nations and particularly, by three U.S. Bases at Puerto Rico, Guantanamo and Panama. But, now the Soviet Union, through Cienfuegos, Cayo Largo and Isle of Pines, is challenging that naval defense of the United States, and the basic routes of navigations in the American Continent are in the Caribbean.

The above concludes my presentation and reaffirms hereby what we said at the beginning, that is, that Cuba on the surface presents a picture which is totally different from what is really happening in caves and underground. Actually, there is another Cuba below that surface that poses a real danger and an actual threat not only to the United States of America, but also to all the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Cienfuegos is not the only reason why Cuba is actually a TROJAN HORSE!!!

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 25, 1971]

NIXON SEES THREAT IN CUBA-CHILE TIES

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

President Nixon's foreign policy report for the 1970s today labeled Chile's establishment of ties with Communist Cuba a challenge to the inter-American system. It warned that the United States and its hemispheric part-

ners would be observing closely the evolution of Chilean foreign policy under Marxist President Salvador Allende.

Nixon's comments on Chile were worded diplomatically but contained unmistakable overtones of warning.

Referring to Chile and Cuba in the same section of his speech, Nixon declared:

"We do not seek confrontations with any government. But those which display unremitting hostility cannot expect our assistance."

Nixon said the election of Allende may have profound implications not only for the Chilean people but for the inter-American system as well. The legitimacy of the Allende government is not in question, Nixon declared, but its ideology is likely to influence its actions.

He cited the resumption of ties with Cuba as a case in point since this action was contrary to the collective policy of the Organization of American States.

The United States has a strong political interest in cooperating with its neighbors regardless of their domestic viewpoints, Nixon said. But echoing the words of President John F. Kennedy, he said "we have a clear preference for free and democratic processes."

HITS DICTATORS

This part of the message clearly was aimed at rightist dictatorships as well as dictatorships of the left.

Nixon said the U.S. will deal with governments as they are and that United States relations depend on actions affecting the inter-American system rather than internal structures or social systems.

In regard to Chile, he said, "our bi-lateral policy is to keep open lines of communication. We will not be the ones to upset traditional relations. We assume that international rights and obligations will be observed. We also recognize that the Chilean government's action will be determined primarily by its own purposes. In short, we are prepared to have the kind of relationship with the Chilean government that it is prepared to have with us."

The President had harsher words for Cuba, now in the 11th year of Communist control. He said Cuba continues to exclude itself from the inter-American system by its encouragement and support of revolution and its military ties to the Soviet Union.

The Russians, he said, have been attempting to expand their influence and military presence in Cuba.

Those governments which violate the system by intervening in the affairs of their neighbors or facilitating the intervention of non-hemispheric powers, he said cannot expect to share the benefits of inter-American cooperation.

"We will work constructively with other members of the community to reduce the disruptive effects of such actions," the President said.

He also informed the nation that he intended to submit legislation soon for promotion of Latin American trade through generalized tariff preferences.

Nixon said he intended to assure special U.S. attention in trade policies for commodities of particular interests to the Latin region and to continue to press for elimination or reduction of nontariff barriers which harm exports of Latin America and other developing areas.

PROMISES GUIDES

He also promised to establish guidelines for the resources to be provided to Latin America through the new development institution and to seek final agreement this year among industrial countries for untying the bulk of development assistance.

Nixon said he would again urge Congress

to establish an office of Undersecretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs.

Referring to the rising forces of nationalism and extremism in Latin America, Nixon said the United States must seek to preserve the fabric of hemispheric unity. He said we cannot afford to withdraw out of frustration or allow ourselves to become isolated. The U.S. he said will avoid actions which foster or reinforce anti-U.S. nationalism.

TENANTS' RIGHTS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the plight of urban apartment dwellers has been a subject of continued discussion in the Congress since the days of the depression during the 1930's. As an attorney who, on many occasions, has represented tenants in the courts of New York City and as a public official who has lived closely with the precarious plight of tenants I have long wondered if the courts of our State would ever reach the point of understanding that we can no longer afford the luxury of applying old legal concepts to present landlord-tenant problems.

It has been stated time and time again that the primary remedy a tenant has against a landlord, if the latter renders the apartment uninhabitable is to remove himself from the apartment and in an action for rent by the landlord raise the defense that he had been constructively evicted. I am not certain that such a rule of law would make sense even if there were a sufficient number of vacant apartments in the city of New York for tenants to move into. However, this point becomes moot in light of the vacancy rate that presently exists in New York City; it is under 1 percent. Under these circumstances to suggest to a tenant that his remedy against a landlord who makes no effort to make an apartment habitable is to break his lease with impunity is an absurdity. Where is the tenant and his family supposed to go? In many urban areas throughout the country and certainly in my own city the answer is nowhere. Therefore, it is abundantly clear that new approaches to landlord-tenant relationships must be developed if today's realities are to be met. Bob Dylan prophetically stated in one of his songs "the times they are a-changin'." At least one member of the judicial system in the city of New York has recognized that radical changes are needed in the area of landlord-tenant law. Judge Leonard H. Sandler, a recently elected reform-minded judge of the civil court of the city of New York recently wrote a landmark decision dealing with precisely the problem I speak of today. Judge Sandler in his decision very succinctly presented the question which judges face day after day in landlord-tenant parts of our courts throughout the nation. He stated:

The question is whether there is fixed in law of this state so firmly that this court is bound to follow it a system of values that

regards the right of the landlord to receive rent as infinitely more important than, and wholly independent of, either his obligation to obey the law or the corresponding right of the tenant to live in a decent apartment maintained in substantial compliance with the law.

Judge Sandler quite correctly found that landlords' rights only exist where they have fulfilled their responsibilities to their tenants and certainly do not exist where they have, as in the instant case, taken affirmative action to harass the tenants.

I strongly recommend Judge Sandler's opinion to my colleagues, and am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

CIVIL COURT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

(Amanuensis, Ltd., Petitioner, against Barnett Brown, Robert Bennett and Angelo Montanez, Respondents; Index Number L & T 53934/70, Part 25)

Sandler, J.:

At a time when the basic fairness and reasonableness of the rules of law regulating relations between landlords and residential tenants are under cogent and persuasive challenge, these non-payment proceedings against three tenants raise questions of grave importance concerning the capacity of our courts to adapt older doctrines to the requirements of fair treatment for tenants living today in multiple dwellings, and most especially fair treatment for those who are poor and without resources.

The most urgent question is whether this court is required to issue warrants of eviction for nonpayment at the instance of a landlord who has flagrantly and systematically refused to operate the building from which it derives rent in accordance with the minimum standards of decency prescribed by the Multiple Dwelling Law and the Housing Maintenance Code. Differently phrased, the question is whether there is fixed in the law of this state so firmly that this court is bound to follow it a system of values that regards the right of the landlord to receive rent as infinitely more important than, and wholly independent of, either his obligation to obey the law or the corresponding right of the tenant to live in a decent apartment maintained in substantial compliance with the law.

A second important question involves the constitutionality of that part of Sec. 302(a) of the Multiple Dwelling Law that requires a tenant to deposit in court that rent demanded by a landlord in a nonpayment proceeding before he can interpose the statutory defense that a rent-improving violation had continued for 6 months.

Finally, the tenants sought by a post-trial motion to conform the pleadings of the proof to secure damages on the ground that the landlord had failed to maintain adequate security against criminal acts—and that the failure contributed to numerous crimes against them for which, it is urged, the landlord is responsible on tort principles. The issue sought to be presented is important—and the facts before me present a substantial basis for the claim. See *Kline v. 1500 Massachusetts Avenue Apartment Corp.*, F2d D.C. Cir. Ct. of App. (1970) N.Y.L.J. Aug. 27 (1970). However, I have determined that the post-trial motion should be denied without prejudice to the claims being presented in a new pleading. The landlord is entitled to meet this substantial issue after adequate notice prior to trial.

The significant facts are not in serious dispute. On or about April 15, 1969, the present owners of 310 West 18th Street (the previous mortgagees) acquired the premises.

At that time, and for several years previously, there existed numerous Housing Code violations recorded against the property. The new owners did nothing, or virtually nothing, to correct these violations.

One of the landlord's principals testified that their plan was to persuade the tenants to leave the building by offering relocation payments, and thereafter to remodel the building. He admitted that the landlord had no plans to correct the violations if all of the tenants did not leave.

The conclusion is inescapable, and I so find, that the landlord's design was and is to force the tenants to leave by permitting the violations to continue and the living conditions to become increasingly onerous.

Thus, there has persisted from the date of acquisition until trial a host of record violations. One is a rent-impairing violation affecting the entire building; several others are rent-impairing violations affecting individual apartments (though not the apartments of these tenants); and there are some 90 other violations varying in importance and extent, but the cumulative effect of which is to reduce significantly the habitability of the apartments of the tenants. The efforts of code enforcement agencies have been to no avail.

In addition, the evidence strongly suggests that the landlord tried to "persuade" the tenants to leave by total indifference to the requirements of security against criminal acts. Thus although the lock on the building's front entrance was broken, the landlord took no steps to repair it for many months. When illegal intruders moved into abandoned rooms, and it became apparent that these included drug addicts with a high potential for crime, the landlord took no action to remove them. Each of these tenants was the victim of several crimes.

I find: (1) that the landlord operated this building in willful disregard of its obligations under the Multiple Dwelling Law and the Housing Code, and that the quality of living for the tenants was significantly impaired as a result; (2) that the code enforcement procedures proved wholly ineffective to induce compliance with the law by this landlord; and (3) that one objective of this landlord's behaviour was to coerce the tenants to abandon their apartments.

At the trial, the tenants acknowledged that they had not paid rent for some time. Two principal defenses were interposed.

First, it was claimed that the landlord had breached a warranty of fitness for use and a warranty of quiet enjoyment, which defenses I interpret as raising the question presented at the outset of this opinion.

Second, it was alleged that a rent-impairing violation under Sec. 302(a) of the Multiple Dwelling Law affecting each of the tenants had lasted for 6 months. Since two of the tenants did not deposit the rent demanded by the landlord into court, as required by subsection (c) of Sec. 302(a), this defense requires the court to consider the constitutionality of that requirement.

In addition, the tenants sought damages for breach of the warranty of fitness for use, or habitability.

In considering whether this court is compelled to sustain the right to rent of a landlord who operates a residential building in systematic violation of the law, I am of course aware of the general view that this issue has been definitively resolved in favor of the landlord by controlling appellate decisions. After a careful analysis of the leading cases I am persuaded that they leave this court ample discretion to achieve decent and fair results in accordance with present day realities, and I intend to exercise that discretion.

The leading cases in this area are *Davar Holdings, Inc. v. Cohen*, 255 A.D. 445 (1st

Dept. 1938), rearg. den. 256 A.D. 806, affd. 280 N.Y. 828 (1939), and *Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank v. 108 West 49 Street Corp.*, 255 A.D. 570 (1st Dept. 1938), affd. 280 N.Y. 291 (1939), both First Department cases decided within a few months of each other. Considering the tremendous influence these decisions have had on the day by day disposition of landlord and tenant matters in the trial court of this State, it is surely notable that neither of them confronted the Appellate Division with anything approaching the critical problems of fairness and social policy presented by the case before me—problems common to many present day landlord and tenant cases.

In the *Davar* case, supra, described in the opinion as one of first impression, the lease required the tenant to comply with the requirements of law, and he failed to have the apartment painted. When a violation was issued against the premises because it had not been painted, the landlord undertook to have the painting done himself, but his painter was barred from the apartment by the tenant. Thereafter the tenant had the apartment painted at his own expense and sought to deduct that expense from his rent.

It is surely not surprising that the Appellate Division found for the landlord.

In doing so, however, the court went on to observe that at common law the landlord was under no duty to repair. At p. 448 the court said the following:

"We are of the opinion, therefore, that in a case of this character the tenant may not, himself, procure the required work to be done. Under an order so issued, the controversy is between the landlord and the public authorities. It is the landlord and not the tenant who must satisfy the department that the work has been done properly. The statute providing, as it does, its own penalties, should not, as between landlord and tenant, be further extended in scope."

The court also pointed out that if the conditions ordered to be remedied rendered the premises uninhabitable the tenant could be removed, and, in an action for rent, defended on the basis of constructive eviction.

The *Emigrant* case was similar. The principal distinction is that it involved an action by the lessee of an entire building against an owner. The lessee himself subleased the several apartments to tenants, and the court wisely observed that in any event the Multiple Dwelling Law was intended for the benefit of the tenants actually occupying the apartments, not one in the position of their landlord.

Notwithstanding the widely held view to the contrary, it is my opinion that the Appellate Division did not intend to lay down a rule of universal application, precluding under all circumstances the claim that violations of the Multiple Dwelling Law and the Housing Code are a defense to rent, however substantial and pervasive the violations, and whatever their impact on the habitability of the dwelling. The approach set forth in the *Davar* opinion seems to me more sensibly construed as designed to apply to the kind of situation before that court—one in which the landlord had acted in good faith, the violation did not significantly impair habitability or create an emergency danger, and in which code enforcement might well have been expected to be effective to achieve the statutory purpose. And this view of the holding seems to me to be powerfully buttressed by considerations of fairness, sound legal principles and compelling social need.

Preliminarily it is clear that the decision was strongly influenced by two factual assumptions, undoubtedly well founded in 1938, but neither of which would be seriously urged as realistic today.

The first assumption was that code enforcement penalties were likely to be effective.

But the history of the last 32 years surely demonstrates their inadequacy to assure broad compliance with the law. See Gribetz and Grad, *Housing Code Enforcement: Sanctions and Remedies*, 66 Colum. L. Rev. 1254 (1966), Note, *Enforcement of Municipal Housing Codes*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 801 (1965). The facts of the instant case are illustrative. The bulk of the violations here have continued since 1966, and repeated court proceedings by the enforcement agency have wholly failed to move the landlord to obey the law.

The second factual assumption was that a tenant whose apartment had ceased to be habitable could readily move to a suitable apartment maintained in accordance with the law. The sustained and severe housing shortage dating from World War II and the accompanying deterioration of much of our housing supply, have surely rendered constructive eviction an illusory protection for the urban tenant—and especially for the poor tenant. The language in the *Davar* opinion suggesting that tenants could simply move and then defend against rent proceedings has a nostalgic flavor today.

Without presuming to anticipate that the Appellate Division would overrule *Davar* because of the subsequent invalidation of two of its basic assumptions, it is surely appropriate to find in this development additional support for a comparatively limited interpretation of that decision.

Significantly, modern scholarship is unanimous in its outspoken condemnation of the unfairness and harmful social consequences of a doctrine that permits a landlord to recover rent and evict tenants while defying the statutory requirement that he maintain the premises in accordance with the law. See Quinn and Phillips, *Law of Landlord-Tenant: Evolution of the Past and Guidelines for the Future*, 38 Fordham L. Rev. 225 (1969); Sax and Hiestand, *Slumlordism as a Tort*, 65 Mich. L. Rev. 869 (1976); Schoshinski, *Remedies of the Indigent Tenant: Proposal for Change*, 54 Georgetown L.J. 519 (1966).

The origin of that principle has been traced to feudal times when the tenants' concern was possession of the land, and when, by tenurial concepts, "rents" issued directly from the land itself. I am not aware of any persuasive answer to the argument that it is absurd to apply principles rooted in feudalism to modern day apartment dwellers who seek a "house suitable for occupation". *Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, 428 F.2d 1071, 1078 (D.C. Cir. 1970).

Moreover, the profound incongruity of the older concept with the whole evolution of modern law, premised on the interdependence of rights and responsibilities, has been convincingly demonstrated. See Quinn and Phillips, supra, at 225-227; Javins, supra, at 1075-1077.

Most important of all, the disastrous social and human consequences of applying outdated concepts to the housing problems of the urban poor have been eloquently described. See Quinn and Phillips, supra; Sax and Hiestand, supra; Schoshinski, supra.

Thus, in a widely discussed recent article, two scholars condemned much of the law of landlord-tenant as a "scandal", and went on to say:

"More often than not unjust in its preference for the cause of the landlord, it can only be described as outrageous when applied to the urban poor in the multiple dwelling. There it views with complacency the most wretched living conditions, littered and unlit hallways, stairways with steps and bannisters missing, walls and ceilings with holes, exposed wiring, broken windows, leaking pipes, stoves and refrigerators that do not work or work only now and then. And always the cockroaches, and the dread of the winter cold and uncertain heat." Quinn and Phillips, supra, at 225.

Finally, the high courts of a number of jurisdictions, when recently confronted with the kind of question here presented, have uniformly responded by overthrowing or modifying drastically the older approach, and by shaping new principles more evenhanded in their treatment of landlord and tenant. *Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, supra; *Lemle v. Breedan*, 462 F.2d 470 (Hawaii 1969); *Reste Realty Corp. v. Cooper*, 251 Atl.2d 263 (N.J. 1969); *Marini v. Ireland*, 265 Atl.2d 526 (N.J. 1970); *Brown v. Southall Realty Co.* 237 Atl.2d 834 (D.C. Ct. of App. 1967); *Pines v. Persson*, 111 N.W.2d 409 (1961); *Shiro v. W. E. Gould & Co.*, 165 N.E. 2d 286 (Ill. 1960).

The most important of these recent cases is *Javins*, supra, which is destined, in my view, to be a landmark decision. After a comprehensive review of the law and its relation to modern legal development and present conditions, the court concluded, at 1082:

"We therefore hold that the Housing Regulations imply a warranty of habitability, measured by the standards which they set out, into leases of all housing that they cover . . . Under contract principles, however, the tenant's obligation to pay rent is dependent upon the landlord's performance of his obligations, including his warranty to maintain the premises in habitable condition."

In view of the foregoing, one must conclude that the doctrine set forth in *Davar* was intended to be, and now should be, limited to the kind of circumstances then before the court.

I therefore hold that violations of the Multiple Dwelling Law and the appropriate sections of the Housing Code permit residential tenants to raise defenses to non-payment eviction proceedings in the following three situations, all of which were established by the evidence in this case.

First, where the landlord has not made a good faith effort to comply with the law, and there have been substantial violations seriously affecting the habitability of the premises.

Second, where there are substantial violations and code enforcement remedies have been pursued and have been ineffective.

Third, where substantial violations exist and their continuance is part of a purposeful and illegal effort to force tenants to abandon their apartments.

In the *Javins* case the Circuit Court plainly declared its view, in accordance with accepted contract principles, that the presence of substantial violations should wholly defeat the claim for rent. A persuasive case can be made, in my opinion, for reducing the rent in proportion to the gravity of the violations, cf. *Academy Spires, Inc. v. Brown*, 268 Atl.2d 556 (N.J. 1970).

In this case however there is one circumstance that requires a minimal judicial response the denial of all rent: namely, the use by this landlord of long-continued violations as an integral part of his plan to effectuate the removal of all the tenants. Such an illegal, deliberate effort is intolerable, and precludes recovery of any part of the rent claimed.

The above holdings are consistent with the high purposes that induced the Legislature to enact the Multiple Dwelling Law and are essential, in my opinion, to the achievement of those purposes.

Here, as in so many other areas of the law, the words of Justice Cardozo eloquently describe the human and social reality:

"We may be sure that the framers of this statute, when regulating tenement life, had uppermost in thought the care of those who are unable to care for themselves. The legislature must have known that unless repairs in the rooms of the poor were made by the landlord, they would not be made by anyone.

The duty imposed becomes commensurate with the need. The right to seek redress is not limited to the city or its officers. The right extends to all whom there was a purpose to protect." *Altz v. Lieberman*, 233 N.Y. 16, 19 (1922).

Accordingly, I sustain the defense based on a breach of the warranty of habitability and find on that ground for each of the respondents.

Turning to the defense based on Sec. 302(a) of the Multiple Dwelling Law, the evidence is clear that a rent-impairing violation affecting the entire building continued for over 6 months. As to one of the tenants, Barnett Brown, the rent demanded has been deposited in court so the defense as to him may be sustained without further discussion.

The other two respondents, not having tendered the rent demanded, challenge the requirement as unconstitutional.

In pertinent part the statute provides:

302(a) If the official records of the department shall note that a rent impairing violation exists in respect to a multiple dwelling and that notice of such violation has been given by the department, by mail, to the owner last registered with the department and (ii) such note of the violation is not cancelled or removed of record within six months after the date of such notice of such violation, then for the period that such violation remains uncorrected after the expiration of said six months, no rent shall be recovered by any owner for any premises in such multiple dwelling used by a resident thereof for human habitation . . .

(c) to raise a defense under subparagraph a in any action to recover rent . . . the resident . . . must also deposit with the clerk of the court . . . at the time of filing of the respondent's answer the amount of rent sought to be recovered in the action or upon which the proceeding to recover is based, to be held by the clerk of the court until final disposition of the action.

Although involving a very different statute, the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Snidach v. Family Finance Corp.* of Bay View, 395 US 337 (1969), seems to me very much to the point. The Supreme Court there struck down as violative of procedural due process a Wisconsin statute that required an employer, upon service of a summons in a garnishment action, to withhold up to 50% of the employee's wages, without any opportunity for the employee to be heard.

Even though the money would ultimately be released to the employee if he were successful, this, was not deemed to cure the constitutional infirmity found in the temporary withholding of part of the wages without a hearing.

We are here concerned with rent money rather than wages, but the vice of the section under attack is the same, and indeed the circumstances taken as a whole seem to me rather more aggravated.

By preventing the tenant from asserting the defense until he has deposited the money demanded, the New York legislature has effectively deprived tenants of the use of their own money for indefinite periods of time without any prior opportunity to be heard.

Three factors combine to make this condition wholly arbitrary and unreasonable, and a violation of procedural due process.

First, the tenant is required to deposit the very amount claimed by the landlord, without any provision for a hearing to insure that the demand is accurate. Thus if a landlord should demand several times the amount actually due the tenant's inability to deposit an exaggerated amount could preclude him from presenting an otherwise conclusive defense.

Second, no time limit is fixed for the landlord to commence proceedings subject to the

defense. A landlord may choose to wait many months, or indeed years, putting the tenant under the burden of setting aside monthly reserves of money so that he might raise the defense when and if the proceedings were commenced. Surely this indefinite deprivation of the use of money, without any kind of hearing, cannot be reconciled with procedural due process. Cf. *Midman Realty Corp. v. Kane*, NYLJ Jan. 20, 1971, p. 19, Civ. Ct. of N.Y. Myers, J.

Finally, the issue presented by the statute makes the requirement of deposit peculiarly unreasonable. For surely in most cases, as in this one, the official records of the appropriate agency will establish, at least presumptively, the validity or invalidity of the defense.

At the very least, a tenant should be permitted to present an official record establishing the violation, and its duration, in lieu of depositing the money. Cf. *Bell v. Tsintolas Realty*, 430 F.2d 474 (1970) pp. 483-485.

The section in question reminds me of an episode in Voltaire's *Zadig*, subtitled "An Oriental Fable", in which the hero was erroneously accused of having falsely denied that he had observed certain valued pets of the royal family. The novelist reports that according to the custom of that realm;

"They condemned Zadig to pay 400 ounces of gold for having said he had not seen what he had seen; first he had to pay the fine; after which Zadig was permitted to plead his cause before the Council of Destenham."

In sustaining the right of the non-depositing respondents to interpose the defense, I reach the same result as a matter of statutory construction under the special facts presented.

In this case the defense was interposed by one tenant who made the required deposit—and the evidence established a rent-impairing violation affecting each of the apartments.

I cannot believe that the legislature intended to deprive the court of the power, under such circumstances, to apply that finding to other tenants, and I accordingly do apply it.

Finally I come to the counterclaim in which the tenants seek damages for violation of a warranty of quiet enjoyment and fitness for use. I am entirely satisfied that such a violation may indeed result in damages in excess of the rent sought. Putting to one side the damages arising from the crimes referred to, I do not believe that damages in excess of rent have been proved. And as to the criminal acts, I think that the issues involved in them, which were sought in part to be raised by the above counterclaim and in part by the post-trial motion to conform the pleadings to the proof, should be resolved in a separate trial on the basis of new pleadings which permits resolution of all of the issues raised by that claim for damages.

Accordingly, judgments are to be entered dismissing the petitions here in all respects, with costs to the respondents.

THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 23, the CBS Television Network broadcast a telling documentary entitled "The Selling of the Pentagon."

In 1 hour, this outstanding example of

journalism bared before this Nation the razzmatazz public relations program of the Military Establishment.

I congratulate everyone connected with the production.

A script of the program follows:

THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

(As broadcast over the CBS television network, Feb. 23, 1971)

Produced and Written by: Peter Davis.
Correspondent: Roger Mudd.
Research: James Branon and Helen Moed.
Executive Producer: Perry Wolff.

ROGER MUDD (voice over). Last spring American soldiers fought a two day battle that did not get into the newspapers or onto the television news broadcasts. Very few people even knew about it. The battle was fought neither in Vietnam, nor in Cambodia, nor anywhere else in Southeast Asia. All the action took place in North Carolina. This was a military exercise but it was also an exercise in salesmanship—the selling of the Pentagon.

SPEAKER (for Marine Corps). Gentlemen, today we have shown you the individual Marine—the man who implements foreign policy. He comes from all walks of life, all over the U.S.A. He's not much different from the young men we see on the street corners of America today, except he's been trained as a Marine.

He believes in what he is doing, and he's dedicated to his country and to the job at hand, whatever it may be. In short, we could say he has a lot of plain old, red-blooded American guts. Now this concludes our demonstration at this range. The escorts will now show you to your buses. Thank you very much.

ROGER MUDD. Nothing is more essential to a democracy than the free flow of information. Misinformation, distortion, propaganda all interrupt that flow. They make it impossible for people to know what their Government is doing, which, in a democracy, is crucial. The largest agency in our Government is the Department of Defense, and it maintains a public relations division to inform people of its activities.

In December, Congress cut the appropriations for this division, but, according to the Pentagon, it will still spend 30 million dollars this year on public affairs—an amount more than 10 times greater than what it spent to tell people about itself just 12 years ago. Even this figure may be only the tip of the public relations iceberg. A special, still unpublished report for the prestigious 20th Century Fund estimates the real total at 190 million dollars. The combined news budgets of the three commercial television networks—ABC, CBS, and NBC—are 146 million dollars.

Whatever the true cost at the Pentagon, there have been recent charges in the press and in Congress that the Department is using these public relations funds not merely to inform but to convince and persuade the public on vital issues of war and peace. Ten months ago, CBS News set out to investigate these charges and to examine the range and variety of the Pentagon's public affairs activities.

We selected three areas for concentration: direct contacts with the public, Defense Department films, and the Pentagon's use of the media—the press and television. We sought no secret files, no politicians pleading special causes, no access to classified documents. We looked only at what is being done for the public—in public.

We began at an obvious location—Armed Forces Day on a military base. Fort Jackson, South Carolina is proud of its soldiers, and once a year the public is invited, to come out and take a look at them. At dozens of other bases, dozens of other audiences see the same show. The major event is a firepower display. But in the interests of information, they not only shoot, they also instruct.

INSTRUCTOR. The killing zone is 50 metres deep, 50 metres wide, and two metres high. However, its fragments are also effective against light skinned vehicles.

MUDD. The weapons officer on this range claimed that the information display cost two million dollars. Later, Army public relations officials put the expense at twenty-two thousand dollars.

The last part is known as the "mad minute." It would be hard to argue with that description.

When the demonstration itself is over, another activity begins. The ammunition is gone but the weapons are not. Some of these are turned over to children so they can get the heft and feel of the genuine article.

FIRST CHILD. All right, Jack, here's a cool tank man.

SECOND CHILD. I'm going over to the other tank.

THIRD CHILD. Get off.

FIRST CHILD. What are you doing?

THIRD CHILD. I'm going to shoot you.

SECOND CHILD. Ready . . . aim . . . fire!

Colonel MACNEILL. In the Chinese view only one country has been liberated from colonialism, and that is North Vietnam. The others will not be considered liberated, in the Chinese viewpoint, until each and every one has a Communist government.

MUDD. The Pentagon has a team of Colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy. We found them in Peoria, Illinois, where they were invited to speak to a mixed audience of civilians and military reservists. The invitation was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Company, which did 39 million dollars of business last year with the Defense Department. The Army has a regulation stating: "personnel should not speak on the foreign policy implications of U.S. involvement in Vietnam."

Colonel MACNEILL. Well now we're coming to the heart of the problem—Vietnam. Now the Chinese have clearly and repeatedly stated that Thailand is next on their list after Vietnam. If South Vietnam becomes Communist it will be difficult for Laos to exist. The same goes for Cambodia, and the other countries of Southeast Asia. I think if the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, the record in the North—what happened in Tet of '68—makes it clear there would be a bloodbath in store for a lot of the population of the South. The United States is still going to remain an Asian power.

MUDD. Over the years, the Colonels have travelled—at taxpayers' expense—to 163 cities and spoken to 180 thousand people. In a question and answer period, they promote American presence in Southeast Asia.

Colonel SERRILL. The bloodbath, the indications at Hue during the Tet offensive as to what might be in store for people who would otherwise have some semblance of freedom or individuality, if we did stay and protect their interests as well, admittedly, as our own.

Colonel BIRD. I personally believe by and large the college students are very sincere in their belief. I think a lot of them haven't attempted to study, to some degree, the history of other things like this.

Colonel MACNEILL. Some say there are no interests at stake today, some say we had none in the beginning. I feel when we put half a million men in there, at least we placed national interest at stake when we did that.

FIRST CHILD. I want to play this one.

SECOND CHILD. Now it's my turn.

FIRST CHILD. Bob, let's see if you can do this.

THIRD CHILD. Let Danny do it.

FATHER. How many mistakes you gonna make?

MUDD. At a St. Paul, Minnesota shopping mall, an Army display emphasizes power, a recurrent theme in Defense Department public relations programs. The Army Exhibit Unit has been to 239 cities in 46 states

and has been seen by over 20 million people. The cost to taxpayers: 906 thousand dollars a year.

RECORDED ARMY NARRATOR. The four M's—Mission, Motivation, Modernization, and Management—summarize Army Chief of Staff General William C. Westmoreland's program for the future of the Army.

MUDD. The Army says it won't send these exhibits out unless requested by local civilians. The manager of this shopping mall told us how the Army's exhibit happened to be there.

Mr. PETERS. We were approached by Sergeant Kerr who is the local recruiting sergeant in this area, a matter of three weeks ago, and he simply asked us would we care to have the exhibit here in our mall. We said yes. So, it's here.

ANNOUNCER (for Air Force). Approaching next will be Major Mike Kirby and his next maneuver, the exciting Wing Walk and Roll.

MUDD. The Air Force Thunderbirds flew 108 exhibitions last year in front of 6 million people. We were told that the Thunderbirds are supposed to attract volunteers, but what we found was a very elaborate commercial for air power.

ANNOUNCER (for Air Force). The Air Force has proved again and again its superiority against the enemy in the air war over North Vietnam. In an environment where the majority of our fighter pilots were flying tactical bombing missions and not primarily hunting for enemy aircraft, the enemy still lost three aircraft for every one of ours in air-to-air combat.

General LEWIS WALT. We fought them up on the DMZ, we fought them across the Laos border, we fought them down south across the Cambodian border. But they're trying to keep the war going on—why? Because they think that we're going to give up and pull out before the job is done. That's what they've been told, that's what they read in our newspapers and our magazines.

MUDD. Tonight, like any other evening, there are between 6 and 10 Pentagon speakers appearing in public. With military transportation at their disposal they traverse the country shaping the views of the audiences. For years, General Lewis Walt has been the Marine speaker most in demand.

General WALT. This is what's kept the war going on. If we could have had the entire American nation in back of us, all of our Americans in back of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, this war would have been over a year and a half ago.

GREEN BERET ANNOUNCER. Please pay particular attention to the hands, the elbows, the knees, and the toe of the boot, which are used to deliver killing blows to the vulnerable portions of the body.

MUDD. When it comes to sheer muscle, the legendary Green Berets are the Army's glamorous exhibit. In 21 states last year, the Berets showed how people kill people sometimes. On one occasion, they showed about a thousand kids in New Jersey.

When the Berets finished their act, the audience had its own turn.

CHILD. C'mon . . . no! Damn you . . . ow! (Crying.)

MUDD. Each year, the Pentagon runs special guided tours for over 3,000 influential civilians. The Joint Civilian Orientation Conference is the aristocrat of these tours, indeed of all Defense Department contacts with the public. For eight days 64 prominent citizens visit key military installations all over the country. To give the community leaders more sense of participation, the Defense Department outfits them in different colors that represent each of the Armed Services. Included in this exclusive party are industrialists, bankers, college administrators, newspaper publishers, and broadcasting executives.

High ranking generals accompanied the civilians. These two, three and four-star chaparones were available for briefing, pic-

ture-taking, and just mingling. CBS News followed the distinguished visitors on a weekend war game in North Carolina. The purpose of these tours, according to the Pentagon, is to teach military realities. The guests are referred to as "major taxpayers." As their education proceeded, we recorded some of the military realities and part of their impact on the civilians.

The Army gave a demonstration of a massive troop airlift. An air and land assault on enemy territory was simulated for the visitors. The idea here was to show that thousands of troops can be transported thousands of miles in just a few hours. What's more, when they get where they're going, they are ready to fight.

JITTERBUG ANNOUNCER. Notice the jitterbugging action as the Cayuse make a thorough search of suspected enemy locations. Such tactics were battle tested in Vietnam.

KENNEDY WAGON ANNOUNCER. To achieve success in combat, an infantry battalion depends upon the fighting strength of its rifle companies. The company is composed of three rifle platoons and a weapons platoon.

MUDD. The 64 civilians themselves paid part of their own costs and the official total price of this tour is only 12 thousand dollars. 12 thousand dollars, however, does not include the amount spent on elaborate briefings, the war game itself, nor the expenses of several thousand servicemen who performed for the civilians along the way.

KENNEDY WAGON ANNOUNCER. 711 tons of ammunition and 308 tons of fuel.

DR. RICHARD CHAMBERLAIN. I for one am very grateful for this privilege of seeing how the defense of the country is being organized.

DAVID CONNOR. I found it enjoyable to talk to the enlisted ranks who are handling the weapons as we got in the tanks. I think there's been a subtle, necessary and important emphasis on talking to the manpower.

OFFICER. Of course it could carry rockets, it could substitute a rocket part for an arm. It has tremendous flexibility.

CIVILIAN. A lot of killpower though.

OFFICER. Oh yes, yes.

MUDD. Civilians were shown some of the more advanced equipment and training methods. Among the ordnance the Marines displayed were their planes, their weapons, their tanks, and, of course, their Commandant, General Leonard Chapman.

OFFICER. Excuse me, General Chapman, this is Mr. Hoover.

General CHAPMAN. How are you sir, nice to see you.

CIVILIANS (in boat). Oh, we can use a kyack . . . That's right . . . Bob, you're getting a little too enthusiastic . . . Oh boy we're really making time now.

ROBERT GREENHILL. I think the message I would take back is that we have a first-class military organization led by first-class leaders and the people who carry the load on the enlisted men are some of the finest people that I've been privileged to see. I'm in the investment banking business and I travel all over the United States and I know that for a fact.

WILLARD DOVER. I think the message is that you can be proud of your boys in service.

MUDD. The Defense Department did not permit CBS News to film what many regarded as the highlight of the tour. But the civilians were not shy in talking about it.

MR. CONNOR. At Fort Hood we all were seated in the gunner's seat of the M-60 Tanks, and we fired the rifles, and were told what excellent shots we were and we were taken over to the recoilless rifles and fired rounds at armored personnel carriers and again told how good shots we were, and we fired grenade launchers and drove tanks and so on . . .

DR. CHAMBERLAIN. We fired tank cannon and recoilless rifles, machine guns. . .

MR. CONNOR. My gun jammed while I was shooting it and I thought Oh my God what a great situation to be in were someone moving on me.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN. It was fun to actually get your finger on the trigger of some of the things like the recoilless weapons that most of us have heard about but hadn't actually seen.

MR. GREENHILL. There is no substitute for hands-on experience.

MUDD. The Defense Department says these demonstrations are merely training exercises for war. War, however is not fought in front of a grandstand.

MARINE ANNOUNCER. Let me remind you that the speed and flexibility which you have seen today and the maneuverability and coordination of the supporting forces is not a demonstration. It is the stock in trade of the United States Marine Corps.

MR. GREENHILL. One of the things I can personally see from this tour is that a Fulbright and Mr. Proxmire make are absolutely baseless.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN. I just wish that all the American people could see what we've seen. I think we'd find much less of this carping at the military and we'd find a lot more understanding.

MR. DOVER. I think that one part of this tour is that you won't find a George Romney statement about being brainwashed.

DR. OLAV SOLA. As we proceeded through numerous phases where we were personally involved my opinion has changed 180 degrees.

JACK WEBB. It seems ironic, that while our finest young men are fighting half-way across the world, other young men and women safe at home, openly advocate abandonment of Vietnam to Communism. Perhaps they really don't know what this war is all about.

MUDD. With scenes of war protesters tinted red for emphasis, the Defense Department introduces a film on Vietnam narrated by television star Jack Webb. Over 300 films a year are made by the Pentagon. Most of them are meant originally for troop information, but a large number is later released for public showing. It is widely known that the Defense Department often helps sympathetic Hollywood producers who need troop support for their war movies. What has received far less attention is that the Pentagon itself spends over 12 million dollars a year on its own pictures. The annual cost of a single Army series "The Big Picture", is 900 thousand dollars and the overall Army film budget is more than 6 and one-half million dollars a year. During the 1960's, at least 52 million Americans saw Pentagon motion pictures. 45,000 public gatherings viewed them and at least 356 commercial and educational television stations have presented them as part of their public service broadcast time. Facts and information—not opinions and attitudes—are supposed to be the ingredients of Defense Department films. An official Pentagon directive states: "propaganda has no place in Defense Department Public Information programs". In preparing this broadcast we looked only at products of the last decade—all made after the thaw in Cold War politics. Well-known journalists and movie stars often serve as narrators for the films as these excerpts show.

ROBERT STACK. Hi. I'm Bob Stack. As you may know one of my hobbies is collecting guns. I've hunted on and off, all my life from California to Mexico to safaris in Africa. Speaking of guns and faraway places, I've just come back from a trip to Vietnam where guns are used for an entirely different purpose.

JOHN WAYNE. The Defense Department has asked me . . .

MUDD. The Pentagon helped John Wayne make "The Green Berets". John Wayne helped the Pentagon make this film in Vietnam. Over a thousand prints are in circulation.

SOLDIER (talking to Wayne). In Vietnam, revolution is a double edged word. The enemy uses it—it's what they call the "aggressive war" they're using against people over here.

WAYNE. That's the story and there's nothing mysterious about the kind of revolution the enemy has in mind—it's the same thing we've seen in many parts of the world ever since the Communist revolution fifty years ago. Murder, assassination, terror, and over here they've killed over 20 thousand civilian leaders. And it's these same brave people, who have had the will and the guts to conduct their own revolution a real revolution for the betterment of their people.

MUDD. Not only movie stars have aided Pentagon propaganda. For patriotic reasons newsmen such as Edward R. Murrow, Lowell Thomas and John Daly often volunteered their talents during World War II and the Cold War. The Pentagon has used many journalists to carry its message, including some years ago, two of the best known broadcasters.

CHET HUNTLEY. I'm Chet Huntley. To most of us, this is the United States Navy—the aircraft carrier, the cruiser, and destroyer. The modern deepwater navy extending American strength across the oceans of the world.

This is the American Navy in Vietnam, moving quickly where and when needed, displaying the flexibility of modern sea power, controlling the seas, extending its influence on land, and holding superiority in the air. A three-way force for peace, here to meet at any spot on the globe.

MUDD. "The Eagle's Talon" made in 1962, narrated by Walter Cronkite, deals with America's response to Communism.

WALTER CRONKITE. Starting in World War II, the aggressive Communist tide has spread in Europe and Asia to engulf its neighbors. Communist China even now has plans to dominate Asia by mass murder—destroying ancient civilizations. Right next door is the nation we freed in 1898—Cuba. A Communist tyranny holds sway and whisks do not hide the naked face of dictatorship. Our army is face to face with Communism around the world. To meet immediate threats on any front we must build up our land forces at home and overseas. This soldier, guarding one of Asia's gateways against Soviet aggression symbolizes the determination of free men everywhere to resist Communist expansion by force of arms.

MUDD. On a policy level, the Pentagon says it has discarded the rhetoric of confrontation. But city by city, public showing by public showing, the language and symbols of the early 60's are still being widely distributed in the 70's. Here, in Elmendorf, Texas this month, a Baptist congregation attends a Pentagon film on Communism made in 1962. Even though the expressed policy of the United States is negotiation and not confrontation—even though Walter Cronkite and Chet Huntley may now disagree with the intent of the films they narrated—even though the roles of journalist and Government spokesman are incompatible—the films grind on and on.

A Pentagon film often contains a map that seems to be bleeding. The blood turns out to be the spread of international Communism. Interpretations of Communism and assessments of Communist intent are significant themes in Defense Department films. In "Red Chinese Battle Plan", an anonymous Pentagon narrator describes a foreign policy bent on world conquest.

PENTAGON FILM NARRATOR. It is a blueprint for world revolution. Red China's battle plan—divide and encircle; conquer and enslave.

MUDD. In an excerpt from a film called "Road to the Wall," the Pentagon has James Cagney tell of a Communist plan that encompasses even more than the world.

CAGNEY. The Wall is a solid fact. It stands in Berlin today. It stands—and will stand—wherever the road of world Communism leads. Someday, according to its builders, it will surround not merely the world, but the moon, the stars, outer space—the universe!

MUDD. In what is perhaps the Pentagon's most ambitious film, "Red Nightmare," Jack Webb presents a Russian scheme to crush American freedom.

FIRST RUSSIAN SOLDIER. Americans! They have too many freedoms.

SECOND RUSSIAN SOLDIER. That is another thing you must remember, Comrade. One day it will be your mission to destroy those bourgeois, capitalist freedoms!

WEBB. Frightening, isn't it?

MUDD. The hero of Webb's film, a lathe-worker named Jerry Donovan, dreams that his town is invaded by Communists. With remarkable ease, they quickly subvert everyone except Donovan himself, who listens with shock to a Commissar's speech.

COMMISSAR. When the moral fibre of the United States weakens, and the economy collapses under the pressures of competitive coexistence, it will be your responsibility Comrades, to purge the minds of the reactionary Americans, so that they will welcome the enlightened Soviet system and conform without resistance to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

DONOVAN (to soldier). Hey! What do you think you're doing?

MUDD. When Donovan returns home, he finds his own daughter about to leave for a commune.

DAUGHTER. It's true Daddy. I did volunteer for farm work.

DONOVAN. Linda, why?

DAUGHTER. The party convinced me that I should free myself of the lingering bourgeois influence of family life. I am ready. Do not interfere. It is for my own good.

RUSSIAN SOLDIER. And Comrade Donovan. Do not think that your deviationist remarks will be overlooked. They will be reported to the proper authorities.

JUDGE. Comrade Donovan, you are accused of the following crimes against the state: subversion, deviationism and treason.

MUDD. 900 prints of "Red Nightmare" are currently in circulation. It was first released in 1962, then reissued in 1965. The film was made for the Armed Forces Directorate on Information.

JUDGE. As an ugly remnant of the diseased bourgeois class, you must be eradicated before the contagion can spread.

DONOVAN. Believe me you Communists can't keep fooling the entire world. You can't even keep fooling your own people. Because the news about Communism is getting around—that it's only another word for slavery!

WEBB. Don't worry Jerry. That bullet will never reach you, because it's time to bring you back from your red nightmare.

MUDD. The Department of Defense believes that one of the best ways to save Americans from a red nightmare that comes true is with films like these. Although the Pentagon labels them informational, these films contain a high proportion of propaganda, as well as an obsession with monolithic Communism. Tax money financed all of them, and they have all been distributed during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. It has been more than a decade since the national policy of peaceful coexistence replaced the harsher rhetoric of early cold war years. But to the filmmakers at the Pentagon, with at least 12 million dollars a year to spend, 1946 seems to have lasted a whole generation.

MUDD. The Pentagon, in Washington, is the command post of a military establishment with a multitude of ways to get its message across to the public. Many millions of Americans are reached by Defense Department displays, tours, and motion pictures. But the widest, most penetrating of all contacts the

Pentagon has with the public is through the media—newspapers, magazines, radio and television. Once each day, the press and the Pentagon have a formal confrontation.

JERRY FRIEDHEIM. I think this is the first time Dr. Foster has discussed the three different kinds of SS-11s . . . That's correct, these are MRV not MIRV. . . .

MUDD. Every morning at 11 o'clock, in pursuit of Defense Department news, Pentagon reporters get a crack at a careful and respected adversary, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Jerry Friedheim. He does not, of course, tell all he knows; he wouldn't have his job long if he did.

FRIEDHEIM. I can't discuss that at all.

NEWSMAN. What about the size of the warhead?

FRIEDHEIM. I just don't have anything I can give you on that. We'll pursue that question.

ROBERT GAROLSKI (NBC News). When did you last have three carriers on station in the Med?

FRIEDHEIM. We'll have to check back and find that date for you.

NEWSMAN. Has the Guam chopped to the Sixth Fleet?

FRIEDHEIM. Negative. It has not.

BOB SCHIEFFER (CBS News). Would she normally be going to replace one of them; is that it?

FRIEDHEIM. That has been the normal operations in the past. We've observed some nineteen Soviet combatant vessels there in recent days. The Sixth Fleet strength is roughly comparable, slightly larger.

NEWSMAN. Slightly larger?

FRIEDHEIM. That's correct.

JACK TOLBERT. It's extremely difficult for a Pentagon reporter, even a regular, to establish sources outside the public affairs arm.

MUDD. Former Public Information Officer Jack Tolbert was an Air Force Major who worked with the press at many military bases for twelve years. He believes that the Defense Department confronts reporters with numerous obstacles.

TOLBERT. The Department of Defense has so many avenues of getting its story across, around, and over and under the media, that I'm not even sure even if every reporter who covered the Pentagon was a hard nosed reporter, that we still wouldn't get the story through.

MUDD. The vastness of the Defense establishment confronts a reporter with an almost impossibly complex task. Pentagon stories develop in many other ways besides formal briefings, but the sheer size of the building itself remains bewildering. Often it is impossible to get to a news story—even when the story does not involve national security—until the Pentagon chooses to announce it. Going into and out of the 30 thousand Pentagon offices each day are 200 thousand phone calls and 129 thousand pieces of mail. But very little of this communicating is done with the press. Although the Department of Defense is the biggest business in America, over 95% of the news bureaus in Washington do not even assign a reporter regularly to the Pentagon. More newsmen cover the pennant race than the arms race. We asked the man in charge of all Pentagon public relations, Assistant Secretary of Defense Daniel Henkin, if he thought the press did a good job covering the Defense Department.

HENKIN. I believe that it does. . . . From time to time of course it gives me some headaches and I give the press some headaches. We understand that. We act professionally, as a professional relationship not only with the Pentagon press and other members of the Washington news corps but with newsmen who cover military activities around the world.

MUDD. What about your public displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers—what purpose does that serve?

HENKIN. Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their Armed Forces. I believe that the American public has a right to request information about the Armed Forces, to have speakers come before them, to have questions, and to understand the need for our Armed Forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what we are doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in the Armed Forces. What are we doing about the racial problem in the Armed Forces, and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions.

MUDD. Well is that sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have, is that the sort of information that gets passed out at state fairs, by sergeants who are standing next to rockets?

HENKIN. No, I wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any exhibit of that kind. Now there are those who contend that this is propaganda. I don't—do not agree with this.

MUDD. What the press wants to reveal, the Defense Department often wants to conceal. We asked the Washington Post's military specialist, George Wilson, who should be prouder of Pentagon press coverage, the press or the Pentagon.

GEORGE WILSON. The Pentagon by virtue of its overwhelming troops in this area has done better in propagandizing as a whole than the press has done on exposing. I don't fault the digging reporters and there are several. What I fault is the lack of demand from the editors, both of TV and of newspapers generally.

MUDD. How hard is it, Mr. Wilson, for a single reporter at the Pentagon to discover the truth when the Pentagon doesn't want the truth to be known.

WILSON. It's difficult. They can always pull out the secrecy stamp and say it's against the national interest to give you the full explanation for what we did, but you'll just have to trust Big Daddy.

MUDD. Can't a case be made, Mr. Wilson, from the standpoint of national security, to prohibit you from printing in your paper information that the enemy wants to know?

WILSON. It certainly can. A case can be made, but my counter to that is that if it's going to be—if the weapon is going to be described in public as it was in 1969 and 1970, along with the sales job to get the anti-ballistic missile defense approved it should be described accurately. The point here is that because the technology is reachable, that there will always be the pressure to build it. Weapons are inexorable and they're imperious, and only public challenges and public resistance can keep technology from running us right onto the road of Armageddon, and I think that points up why more coverage of the Pentagon is desirable. Editors should have a larger appetite for these weapons because they're not just nuts and bolts; they often dictate the largest policy decisions in the world today.

RADIO VOICE (Hometown News Center). This is Army Specialist Jean Campbell reporting from Pleiku, Republic of Vietnam . . .

MUDD. The Armed Forces do not have to wait for radio, television and newspapers to come to them. They have their own way of reaching the media. At the Army's Hometown News Center in Kansas City, a blizzard of press releases is turned out in all seasons. Each year, 12 thousand radio and television tapes are mailed to 27 hundred radio stations and 546 television stations. Over two million printed releases are sent to six thousand five hundred daily and weekly newspapers. In these releases, medals, promotions and re-assignments are emphasized. While transmitting legitimate information about servicemen, the news center also functions as

a publicity agency for American forces abroad. The only news from the center is good news. The center is commanded by Colonel Richard Stewart, who feels the operation is helpful to the Army.

Colonel STEWART. This is another way of seeing your Army in action and it's even more meaningful because the people can relate to this particular soldier. This is not just an exercise or combat operation or something of that nature but this here is Sergeant Willy Jones.

JACK TOLBERT. There are hundreds and thousands of weeklies and small dailies in this country that live on what we call the hometown release, where the Army, Navy and Air Force maintain hometown news release centers, and are just spewing this stuff into these newspapers who accept it willingly and who print it.

STEWART. They have said time and time again when I've talked to them, they've said, "Keep it coming," in effect, words like that "Keep it coming."

TOLBERT. What the press—and this is the whole press, the community press which is extremely important to this country, is giving a free ride to a military story.

Representative HÉBERT. I'm one of those who believes that the most vicious instrument in America today is network television.

MUDD. Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the anti-military tilt of network reporting. War heroes are made available for the taped home district TV Reports from Pentagon politicians. Here Representative F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana asks Major James Rowe, a Green Beret and former P.O.W., what keeps the Viet Cong fighting.

Major ROWE. The support that the VC receives from the United States is the only thing that keeps them fighting.

MUDD. Later, Congressman Hébert, who is the new Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, asks Major Rowe for his reaction to a peace rally.

Rowe: I walked up and I heard one of the speakers yelling, "Down with imperialism, down with capitalism, down with the oppressive leadership in Washington. Power to the people." I heard the same thing from the Viet Cong except there it was in Vietnamese and here it is in English. I looked around the crowd—I walked through the crowd, and I saw some VC flags flying from the flagpole of the Washington Monument, I saw American flags with VC flags flying over the top of them. I saw American flags with the stars removed and a peace symbol superimposed. I saw the red flag with a black peace symbol on it and then I heard one of my Senators say that "We are here because we cherish our flag." And the only thing I could think of in answer is what flag does he cherish?

HÉBERT. I want to congratulate you. It's an honor to have had you on this program with me, and I only wish to God we could have more people wearing the uniform privileged to speak as you've spoken, because the silent majority will and must be heard.

MUDD. The war is covered extensively not only by the civilian press but also by the Defense Department's own camera crews in Vietnam. Their product is distributed to American TV stations and networks. This is a soccer match played by North Vietnamese prisoners of war and filmed by the Defense Department. It is intended to supplement regular network news coverage. But the Defense Department can hardly be said to be a disinterested observer in Vietnam. Recently, there have been charges that some of the Pentagon's footage was staged. In fact, the cameraman who filmed this soccer game told CBS News that the prisoners had never been permitted to play soccer before but were trotted out for this match when his crew arrived. The cameraman, former Air Force

Sergeant Thomas Demitor, spoke about his filming experience shortly before leaving the service after 16 years.

THOMAS DEMITOR. In many stories that were filmed in Vietnam, with my team, we staged a number of stories of the Vietnamese. We were propagandizing the war and an example of it was a story titled, "US and South Vietnamese forces patrol enemy infiltration routes." We went out with the Vietnamese in the Riverine patrol, went down the river until we found an area that was suitable for our landing. Because I knew it wasn't an actual combat situation I had no fear—I was off the boat on the land before the Vietnamese infantry came up, so that we could get a shot as the boats came onto the shore. We proceeded inland about three quarters of a mile or half a mile while we were getting shots of them running through the rice paddies. They didn't fire any shots. There were no traces of Viet Cong.

We were told when we thought we had a sufficient amount of footage exposed, to tell the Vietnamese and they would turn around. When someone turns around and asks you well do you have enough film, and you say yes, then it is definitely staged.

MUDD. Later, while filming the same story, Sergeant Demitor shot real combat footage involving American troops.

DEMITOR. In the final release, we see none of the actual combat footage of the Americans, we see all of the staged footage of the Vietnamese, and it would lead someone to believe that the Vietnamese were doing the majority of the work. The staged action got in. The actual action did not get in.

HENKIN. We are trying our best to provide information. There undoubtedly have been times when certain actions have been staged. I think this is true of all TV news coverage; after all this interview here is being staged.

MUDD. How so?

HENKIN. Well props were set up, arrangements were made. You and I did not just walk into this room cold. Arrangements were made for it.

MUDD. Well, we wanted to film in your office but your people said let's go into the studio—so we didn't stage it.

ARMY BRIEFER. We are conducting limited duration protective reaction air strikes.

MUDD. Defense Department information machinery is well established in Vietnam, where a special language has developed that takes some time to learn. "Protective reaction" means the United States resumed the bombing of North Vietnam. "Selective ordnance" means napalm. "Defoliation" means nothing will grow there anymore.

A "civilian irregular defense group volunteer" is a mercenary. "Population resettlement" means getting villagers out of their villages, and "Military Assistance Command Daily Press Briefing" means this scene right here, which is popularly known among newsmen in Saigon as the five o'clock follies. The most popular phrase at these sessions, however, needs no explanation.

ARMY BRIEFER. No comment.

FIRST REPORTER. Well, can you please tell us...

ARMY BRIEFER. I have nothing further to add.

SECOND REPORTER. Why don't you answer my question?

ARMY BRIEFER. I have no further comment.

MUDD. Often the Press is an unwitting partner in its own deception. Former Information Officer Tolbert once took great pride in utilizing the media. He's not so proud of the record anymore.

TOLBERT. A network was coming over to cover and do a documentary on the air war over North Vietnam. They were going to film it out of Danang where I was the information officer. So in preparing for them we tried to pick out the most articulate, the best-looking pilots that we could, to be able to describe through their eyes what the

air war was all about. We briefed the pilots so that they would understand that we were trying to present our views in a one-voice concept we didn't want divergent views coming from a variety of the different pilots that might raise questions concerning whether they understood, or whether they were satisfied with the way the air war in the north was being fought.

MUDD. And the cast of characters that you made available to those network men was such that they never heard any dissension or criticism about the bombing mission?

TOLBERT. No, no never. You know, being an insider, knowing fully what was going on, if I was absolutely candid with them, and opened all of our closets to them, yes they would have come out with a lot more balanced report. I could have helped them do that.

MUDD. What was the result of that network team's journalistic efforts?

TOLBERT. Frankly it was just great. It represented the pilots, it represented the way we conceived that the air war in the north was being fought by very professional people and it was as good as if we had done it themselves.

MUDD. Well, I'm duty-bound to ask, I've got to ask you which network it was. Could you tell me?

TOLBERT. Yes, yes I will.

MUDD. Which one was it.

TOLBERT. It was CBS.

MUDD. Well, taking that incident you had with CBS and applying it, Mr. Tolbert, to your 12 years as a public information officer, what effect do you think incidents like that have on a democratic society which is supposed to enjoy a free press?

TOLBERT. I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers able to present its viewpoint to the American people I think this attitude it was able to develop allowed Vietnam to happen. Had we not been able to convince the American people prior to Vietnam that a military solution was a correct solution, without a doubt and not to be questioned we couldn't have had a Vietnam. I feel that if we allow this pervasiveness to continue, that frankly it could lead us to another Vietnam.

MUDD. We have reported tonight only a fraction of the total public relations apparatus belonging to the Pentagon and supported by the taxpayers.

Indeed, the news restrictions on the current invasion of Laos raise the question whether the public's right to know is being served or thwarted.

On this broadcast, we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology. Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world. Not only the public but the press as well has been beguiled—including, at times, ourselves at CBS News. This propaganda barrage is the creation of a runaway bureaucracy that frustrates attempts to control it.

Last November 6, President Nixon sent this memorandum to executive agencies criticizing what he called self-serving and wasteful public relations efforts. He directed an end to what he described as "inappropriate promotional activities." The President specifically ordered—in his words—a curtailment of "broadcasting advertising, exhibits and films."

Just since the memo was written the Army's Golden Knights—a parachute team—have performed for the public in Nevada, California and North Carolina. Other Army exhibits have traveled to 59 different locations.

Air Force displays, like this Hounddog-Quail missile, have appeared in at least 36 shopping malls and municipal centers since the memo was written.

We went back to the Pentagon and asked what effect the Presidential directive would have. We were told there will be cuts in personnel, not activities. There may be some disagreement, of course, over just what constitutes an "inappropriate promotional activity." But to date not a single activity shown on this broadcast has been eliminated. Tomorrow morning, according to Defense Department schedules, there will be an Army show pushing the ABM in Mountain View, California, an Air Force missile will turn up in Houston on Friday, the Pentagon's traveling colonels will be in Hampton, Virginia, on March 8, and next week fifth graders at the Hill Elementary School in Davidson, Michigan, will get to see the Navy's propaganda film on Vietnam.

This is Roger Mudd for CBS Reports.

DEATH OF LT. GEN. DO CAO TRI, OF THE ARMY OF SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1971

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, recently death came to Lt. Gen. Do Cao Tri, a courageous officer of the army of South Vietnam. He was killed in a helicopter crash while leading his troops in bitter fighting in Cambodia.

I ask unanimous consent that a fine tribute paid to this brave South Vietnamese officer by Columnist Joseph Alsop, and published in the Washington Post of February 26, 1971, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRAVE GENERAL IS DEAD

(By Joseph Alsop)

At the grave of Lt. Gen. Do Cao Tri, killed in action some days ago, the humblest apologies should now be offered by many American politicians and large segments of the U.S. press. For Gen. Tri was a particularly striking proof of the way the most mendacious swill has been poured over the heads of brave allies by partisan and interested persons in this country.

If a personal reminiscence is permissible, I first glimpsed Do Cao Tri more than 15 years ago, as a wiry young battalion commander cheering on his men, in a perfect hall of bullets, from the top of a charging tank. Denis Warner, then of "The Daily Telegraph," and I were lying in a ditch at the end of Saigon's old Boulevard Gallieni, watching the attack that broke the stranglehold on the city of the gangster-sect, the Binh Xuyen.

Long before, to keep out the Communists, the French had sold Saigon to this Vietnamese version of the Capone gang. They had now chosen the local Al Capone, the Binh Xuyen boss, Gen. Bai Vien, as the replacement of the intractable President Ngo Dinh Diem. The attack on the Binh Xuyen therefore made the French very angry indeed.

As Warner and I watched, the French general commanding the Saigon District furiously climbed up onto Do Cao Tri's tank, to remonstrate with the youthful battalion commander of South Vietnamese paratroopers. The general's protests were haughty and furious. But when they got nowhere, a huge packet was produced by the general, as though by magic.

I later learned that the packet contained

the equivalent, in those days, of about \$100,000. It was curtly rejected. The French general stumbled off the tank again, rather hastily, for the firing was very brisk. The attack on the Binh Xuyen quickly succeeded. And so South Vietnam was on the long, rough road to nationhood.

Do Cao Tri was certainly not a man without faults. He loved good wine. He liked pretty women. He was fond of money, like so many rich men. But as the foregoing episode rather amply attests, he was never wanting in pride or courage, military efficiency or patriotism.

His personal history was also indicative. A long way back, the first Do Cao (the clan name) was a man who had fought hard against the Manchu conquest of China, and had then refused to collaborate. He was therefore among the Chinese refugees who made the first settlement in the Saigon region in the mid-17th Century.

By the early 19th Century, the Do Cao clan was wealthy and part-Vietnamized, and the great Emperor Gia Long was encouraging the Vietnamese settlement of the rich southern delta. Do Cao Tri's ancestor of the time decided this was better than being a member of the Chinese merchant colony. This was how very great landholdings in the province of Bien Hoa came down to Gen. Do Cao Tri. Despite the land reforms, one must add, he remained a substantial landowner.

After his conquest of the Binh Xuyen gangsters, Do Cao Tri had the sort of up-and-down military career that most brilliant fighting officers had in the difficult years in South Vietnam. But his appointment to command the huge military Region III, around Saigon, marked a major turning point. This was one of the first acts, in truth, by which President Nguyen Van Thieu revealed his quiet determination to transform a political army.

The appointment's real meaning was not understood at the time, in part because the divisions which Gen. Do Cao Tri inherited—the Fifth, the Seventh and the Twenty-Fifth—were universally rated as among the five worst on the whole ARVN roster. Rating the awfulness of ARVN divisions remained a popular indoor sport in Saigon, until President Nixon's brave gamble in Cambodia.

At once, every assumption of Saigon's indoor sportsmen was brutally disproven, primarily by the superb performance in Cambodia of Gen. Do Cao Tri and his troops. Something had been happening to ARVN, which no one had been shrewd enough (or perhaps one should say unfashionable enough) to report.

When Do Cao Tri's helicopter finally failed him, moreover, he was leading two divisions minus of his formerly despised troops, against three enemy divisions that have always been rated among the most formidable in Hanoi's army. And in this operation in Cambodia, still in progress, he was giving the enemy perfect unshirred hell, when he died in the service of South Vietnam.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

NOISE LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a recent study conducted in Chicago by a firm of acoustical consultants showed that transportation is readily identifiable as the major noisemaker in the Chicago area. Since my district encompasses the busiest airport in the world, O'Hare International, these findings come as little surprise to me.

In our effort to improve the environment, we must consider the effects of increasing noise levels. A recent editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times summarized this problem and pointed to a solution that should interest every Member from an urban district:

NOISE LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY

The noise level in American cities has doubled in the last 16 years. The clang and clatter of everyday living is not just a nuisance anymore but a direct threat to human health and well-being, even in the unborn. Continuous loud noise, in the home as well as in the streets, not only can impair hearing but also lead to illness-producing physiological changes.

Medical researchers and psychologists say there is mounting evidence that the high levels of noise to which we are more and more exposed may have cardiovascular, respiratory, glandular and neurological effects. For one thing, noise produces temporary constriction of the smaller arteries, which could mean speeded up pulse and respiration rates. Steady exposure to loud noises may result in hypertension, abnormal heart rhythms or ulcers. Laboratory animals have actually been killed by exposure to extraordinarily high levels of noise.

We all know that a loud unexpected noise can be frightening. Prolonged exposure to noise makes many persons irritable and nervous, though we may not always be aware of a cause and effect relationship. Experiments have shown that a fetus in a pregnant woman can perceive sounds and that loud noises can change its heart rate.

We are assaulted by noise not only from traffic and construction outdoors and machinery in factories, but in our homes. Noise is a by-product of technology and affluence. Consider the electric shavers, washing machines, hi-fidelity phonographs, dishwashers, radios, blenders and all the other power-operated consumer goodies we own and use that raise the noise levels in the home. And then consider the people lucky enough to live near airports.

We can't abolish noise, but we can reduce the noise level of our environment and make living somewhat more comfortable and healthy. Some municipalities are already trying to do so with noise-abatement laws backed up by fines for violators. More than a local approach is needed, however.

President Nixon has asked Congress to take a national approach to the noise pollution problem by granting the new Environmental Protection Administration certain antinnoise powers.

Included would be authority for the EPA to set noise-emission standards for transportation and construction equipment sold in interstate commerce. That would cover just about all vehicles and building equipment. In addition the EPA could require manufacturers of consumer products—power mowers, dishwashers and the like—to state the "noise characteristics" of their wares. This would allow buyers to make a market-

place choice and, perhaps, induce manufacturers to turn out quieter products.

There is no question at all about the need and value of the antinnoise legislation sought by the President. Congress should approve Mr. Nixon's request, quickly and—let us hope—quietly.

FASCELL INTRODUCES EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 10 of last year this body overwhelmingly

approved a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Simply but eloquently it affirmed that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

I am proud to introduce this resolution again today, with two minor changes proposed by its chief sponsor, our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). The first of these changes imposes a 7-year time limit for ratification by the States, and the second extends the effective date from 1 to 2 years after ratification.

The reasons for favorable action on this proposed amendment were convincing last year, and they are even stronger today. Women are heading households

and businesses, pursuing professions, and entering public service to a degree never envisioned by the Founding Fathers. They need and deserve effective protection under the Constitution of the United States. We have come a long way from the first days of the Republic when, under common law definition, women were not legally considered to be persons.

A great effort has been made in this last decade to erase all inequalities under the law. Progress has been realized with such landmark legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

But a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equality for women would be an important affirmation of the egalitarian principles which nourish a vital democracy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 1, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Samuel Cooper, B'nai Jacob Synagogue, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

טוב להודות לה' ולומר לשמך עלי

It is good to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto Thy name, O Most High.—Psalm 92:1.

Eternal God, we offer unto Thee this day the homage of our gratitude. We thank Thee for this good land and for its institutions of freedom and justice. To our thanks, we link our prayers. Humbly and reverently, we ask that Thou bless the Members of this august body upon whose shoulders we have placed the burdensome and demanding affairs of State. Difficult, indeed, are the decisions they are called upon to make and the problems they must resolve. Grant them health and vigor, quicken them with Thy spirit and impart to them of Thy wisdom.

In these days large with challenge and perplexity, we ask not for ease or comfort. We ask, rather, that Thou endow us with those qualities of heart and mind that will help us make real that just and peaceful world envisioned by the Hebrew prophets, the unfulfilled hope and dream of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXPLOSION AT THE U.S. CAPITOL
(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by Mr. Mario Campioli, Assistant Architect of the Capitol, that he received a telephone call from one of the local newspapers at approximately 2:30 a.m. today that an explosion had taken place in the Capitol.

Mr. Campioli immediately called Chief Powell of the Capitol Police, who had already arrived at the Capitol and was on the scene. The Chief advised that the explosion had occurred in the toilet room near the Senate barbershop in the Senate wing of the old section of the Capitol and near the first meeting place of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Campioli arrived at the Capitol at approximately 3:15 a.m. and, after inspecting the damage, called the supervising engineer of the building and asked him to report immediately to the Capitol and to assemble his operating crew at the Capitol as soon as possible.

The amount of explosives still has not been disclosed, but I am able to say it was a very large amount of a very powerful explosive. If any Members will take the time to take a look at the damage, he will be immediately convinced that this was the case.

The damage consists primarily of cracked and otherwise damaged walls, blown-out doors and windows, destruction of trim, paneled jambs, weakened and damaged masonry floor arch construction, and damage to chandeliers. Some of the weakened arch construction will undoubtedly require shoring, and that work is going ahead.

Representatives of the FBI, the District of Columbia Fire Department, the police, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Architect of the Capitol have been on the scene since early in the day and are investigating the matter.

As of this time no overall estimate of the cost of repairing the damage and of time for repair has been made.

As indicated, the explosion occurred in the men's toilet room immediately outside of the Senate barber shop. Substantial damage was caused in the following areas on the first floor: Adjoining

halls and vestibule, rooms S140, S142, S143, S144, and S146, and other damage such as broken glass, cracked plaster, broken windows, and other glassed areas occurred in room S141, the old Supreme Court chamber, the small rotunda on the first floor, in the crypt, the windows on the corridor of the main Senate dining room and the opposite windows in the corridor.

The effect of the blast was indicated by broken glass as far away as the transom over the elevator near the northwest corner of the building.

Some damage also occurred on the second floor in the area immediately above the blast location.

The Architect is proceeding with all possible emergency measures and with cleaning up the area and with ordering the material necessary for permanent repairs.

Mr. Speaker, I think this points up the necessity for additional security measures here in the Capitol of the United States. Many times I have sat here, as the Speaker and other Members of this Chamber have at the joint sessions, when the entire Government is gathered here under one roof, and realized the inadequacy of our security.

I have been terribly concerned that a disaster of monumental consequence could occur here.

I know that in the closing days of the 91st Congress the Congress authorized additional security for the galleries. I hope that work will go forward as quickly as possible.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and I served on the Warren Commission which investigated the assassination of President Kennedy. There was one overriding fact brought out, and that was that the security for the President was inadequate. That was not meant as criticism of anyone, because we live in an open society and an open country and a democracy, and it is often difficult to make a distinction between suppression of the rights of our citizens and personal danger to the people who make up this Government.

The facts are that one can come into the Capitol Building with little or no